

CYBERNETICS AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE LABORATORY
NATIONAL AND KAPODISTRIAN UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
CAIL Monograph Series

The Stars Beyond Ithaca

The *Odyssey* as Proto-Cosmological Journey
and the Necessity of Classical *Paideia*
in the Age of Artificial Intelligence
and Space Exploration

Dimitrios Thomakos

Professor and Director, CAIL
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσεν,
πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω.

Homer, *Odyssey*, I.1–3

Athens · 2026

*This monograph is produced under the auspices of the CAIL
Research Program in Classical Foundations of Formal Thought.*

Abstract

This monograph explores the thesis that Homer's *Odyssey* constitutes, beneath its surface narrative of homecoming, a proto-cosmological allegory of humanity's encounter with radically alien environments — and that its structural logic anticipates, with remarkable precision, the phenomenological, epistemological, and ethical challenges of contemporary space exploration and artificial intelligence. We weave into this central argument the mythological complex of Daedalus, Icarus, and Ariadne, reading each figure as encoding a distinct philosophical stance toward the technology-nature boundary and the problem of return. We argue that the triad of *polytropía* (adaptive intelligence), *mîtos* (the thread of return), and *nóos* (deep rationality) constitutes a coherent classical epistemology of exploration — one that the modern world, in its accelerating rush toward space and artificial general intelligence, urgently requires. The conclusion draws on Stoic cosmopolitanism, Platonic ascent theory, and Aristotelian teleology to argue that classical *paideia* is not ornamental but *architectonic* for any civilization that aspires to explore the cosmos wisely.

Keywords: Odyssey, space exploration, classical paideia, Daedalus, Ariadne, polytropy, artificial intelligence, cosmological allegory, Stoic cosmopolitanism, Overview Effect.

Contents

Preface: A Question from the Present Moment	4
1 The Cosmos as <i>Oikos</i>: The Greek Ontological Frame	5
1.1 Heraclitus and the Living Fire	5
1.2 The Pythagorean Harmony	5
1.3 The Platonic Synthesis	6
1.4 The Critical Implication	6
2 The <i>Odyssey</i> as Alien-World Exploration: A Structural Reading	7
2.1 The Cyclops: Raw Nature Without Logos	7
2.2 The Land of the Dead: Ontological Boundary Crossing	8
2.3 Circe’s Island: The Transformation of the Explorer	8
2.4 Scylla and Charybdis: Navigation Under Absolute Constraint . . .	9
2.5 The <i>Polytropos</i> as Epistemological Ideal	9
3 Daedalus, Icarus, and the Ambivalence of <i>Technê</i>	10
3.1 Daedalus: The First Engineer and His Burden	10
3.2 Icarus: <i>Hubris</i> and the Physics of the Absolute	11
3.3 The Path Not Taken: Daedalus’s Own Flight	11
4 Ariadne’s Thread: The Philosophy of Return	13
4.1 The Thread as Epistemic Lifeline	13
4.2 Ariadne as Philosophy Itself	13
4.3 The Return as Transformation	14
5 Stoic Cosmopolitanism and the Overview Effect	15
5.1 Marcus Aurelius and the Cosmic View	15
5.2 The Stoic Argument for Space Exploration	16
5.3 Thucydides contra the Stoics: The Warning	16
6 Aristotle’s Teleological Challenge	18
6.1 The Teleological Questions	18
6.2 The Aristotelian Critique of the Billionaire Space Race	18
6.3 De Caelo and the Nature of the Heavens	19
7 Classical <i>Paideia</i> in the Age of AI: Why the Greeks Are Not Optional	20
7.1 What <i>Paideia</i> Is	20
7.2 The Specific Contributions of Classical <i>Paideia</i> to the AI Age	21

7.3	The Danger of Technological Solutionism	22
8	The Name That Should Have Been: A Note on Athena	23
9	Synthesis: The Triad of Exploration	25
	Conclusion: Delphi Before the Launch Pad	27
	References	29

Preface: A Question from the Present Moment

γνῶθι σεαυτόν.

Delphic Oracle, as transmitted by Pausanias, *Description of Greece*,
X.24.1

We live in a moment of extraordinary paradox. Humanity prepares to return to the Moon, builds machines that reason and converse, and simultaneously wages wars whose character would be recognizable to Thucydides. The most advanced technological civilization in history cannot answer the most elementary political question: how to live together in peace. We navigate by instruments of incomprehensible precision while remaining profoundly lost.

It is precisely at such moments that the impulse to return to the ancient sources is not nostalgia but *necessity*. The Greeks were not naive. They lived in a world of plague, war, slavery, and political catastrophe. But they possessed something that the modern world has largely surrendered: a habit of asking *first principles questions*, of refusing to accept the adequacy of technique without interrogating the *telos* that technique serves.

This monograph emerges from a conversation about one such first-principles question: what would ancient Greek thought have to say about space exploration? The answer, as these pages argue, is far more than commentary. It turns out that Greek thought — and specifically the *Odyssey* — *already encoded* the deepest structure of the explorer's condition. The stars beyond Ithaca were always there, woven into the poem's logic. We have only, at last, the technology to catch up with the myth.

1. The Cosmos as *Oikos*: The Greek Ontological Frame

τὸν κόσμον τόνδε, τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπάντων, οὔτε τις θεῶν οὔτε ἀνθρώπων
ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ’ ἦν ἀεὶ καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται πῦρ ἀείζων.

Heraclitus, DK 22B30

Before we can understand the *Odyssey* as cosmological allegory, we must grasp the ontological framework within which all Greek thought about the heavens proceeds. For the modern imagination, space is quintessentially *alien*: a void, hostile, indifferent, governed by physical laws that make no reference to human values or human meaning. The astronaut who ventures beyond Earth’s atmosphere is, in this conception, transgressing the natural boundary of human habitation.

The Greek conception is categorically different. The word κόσμος — *kosmos* — means *order, beauty, adornment*. When the Pythagorean tradition first applied this term to the universe as a whole, the claim was radical: the totality of what exists is not chaos but *ordered beauty*, a structure whose rationality the human mind can apprehend because the human mind *participates in the same logos* that organizes the stars.

1.1. Heraclitus and the Living Fire

Heraclitus taught that the cosmos is a perpetually living fire, governed by the λόγος — the rational principle that holds opposites in dynamic tension and ensures that the whole maintains its coherent identity through continuous transformation. For Heraclitus, the human soul that cultivates wisdom becomes aligned with this cosmic logos: it literally shares in the intelligence that moves the stars.¹ Space, on this account, is not alien territory. It is the extended body of the same rational principle that thinks through us when we think well.

1.2. The Pythagorean Harmony

The Pythagoreans elaborated this intuition into a precise mathematical cosmology. The ἁρμονία τῶν σφαιρῶν — the harmony of the spheres — was not merely a poetic metaphor but a claim about the mathematical structure of the heavens: that the celestial bodies move in ratios that correspond to musical intervals, and that the

¹On the Heraclitean logos and its cosmological significance, see Charles Kahn, *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), especially chapters 6–8.

same mathematical order governs both music and the cosmos.² Human music, human mathematics, and cosmic motion are, for the Pythagoreans, three expressions of a single deep structure. To understand mathematics is already to understand something essential about the stars.

1.3. The Platonic Synthesis

Plato's *Timaeus* brings this tradition to its fullest systematic expression. The cosmos, *Timaeus* argues, is a ζῷον ἑμψυχον ἔννοον — a living creature endowed with soul and intelligence.³ It was fashioned by the Demiurge on the model of the eternal Forms, so that it is the most perfect possible material embodiment of rational order. The human soul, with its capacity for mathematical reasoning and philosophical contemplation, was specifically designed to be able to understand this cosmic order — and by understanding it, to align itself with the best in its own nature.

This means that for Plato, the impulse toward space exploration — understood as the desire to go out and contemplate the structure of the heavens directly — is the highest expression of the philosophical eros. The *Phaedrus* myth depicts souls in their preincarnate state traveling through the heavens, beholding the Forms from a cosmic vantage-point.⁴ Space exploration, in the Platonic frame, is literally the attempt to recapture this original vision — to return the soul to its proper cosmological habitat.

1.4. The Critical Implication

The consequence of this ontological framework is decisive: the Greeks had no concept of space as enemy or void. They had, instead, the concept of space as the *extended rational order of which human beings are already a part*. The appropriate human attitude toward the cosmos is not conquest or domination but *theoria* — the contemplative vision that understands without violating. This distinction has enormous practical implications for how we think about space programs, as we shall argue throughout.

²Aristotle reports this doctrine critically in *De Caelo*, II.9, 290b12–29, but his very engagement confirms its centrality to fifth-century thought.

³Plato, *Timaeus*, 30b. See Francis Cornford's translation and commentary: *Plato's Cosmology* (London: Kegan Paul, 1937).

⁴Plato, *Phaedrus*, 246a–249c. The image of the soul's "winged" ascent is one of the most potent in the Platonic corpus and resonates, as we shall see, with the Daedalus myth.

2. The *Odyssey* as Alien-World Exploration: A Structural Reading

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,
πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν.

Homer, *Odyssey*, I.3–4

The thesis that the *Odyssey* is, beneath its surface narrative of Mediterranean wandering, an allegory of humanity's encounter with radically alien environments is not new in its intuition, but it has rarely been developed with systematic rigor. We propose to do so here.

The key to the reading lies in the opening lines of the poem. Odysseus is characterized as πολύτροπος — *polytropos*: he who turns many ways, he of many turns, the man of many devices. He has seen the cities of many peoples and known their minds (νόον ἔγνω). He has suffered many pains (ἄλγεα) in his soul (θυμόν). These three characterizations — adaptability, knowledge of alien minds, and the cost of exposure — are precisely the defining features of the deep-space explorer.

2.1. The Cyclops: Raw Nature Without Logos

The encounter with Polyphemus (Book IX) is the poem's most sustained meditation on *intelligent life that lacks civilization*. The Cyclopes are giants who possess physical power beyond human measure, but they have no ἀγοραί (assemblies), no θέμιστες (customary laws), and no cultivation of the earth.⁵ Each one is a law unto himself.

This is not merely a description of barbarism. It is a philosophical thought-experiment: what does intelligence look like when divorced from logos in its social dimension? Polyphemus can speak and reason at a basic level, but he cannot *negotiate*. He has no concept of *xenia* (guest-friendship), the sacred Greek institution of reciprocal hospitality that structures all civilized encounter with the stranger.

The application to space exploration is precise. When we speak of potential extraterrestrial intelligence, we face exactly this question: the presence of intelligence does not guarantee the presence of anything resembling human social rationality. Odysseus survives not by superior force but by *metis* — cunning intelligence — and specifically by manipulating the gap between the Cyclops's power and his lack of

⁵*Odyssey*, IX.112–115. The absence of political institutions is explicitly linked to the Cyclopes' nature as ὑπερφίαλος — “overbearing” — a term that in Homer always signals the absence of the reciprocal social bonds that constitute civilization.

social reasoning. His famous “No-man” stratagem (Οὐτίς) is a linguistic operation performed on a mind that cannot handle the reflexive complexity of language turned against itself.⁶

2.2. The Land of the Dead: Ontological Boundary Crossing

The *Nekyia* of Book XI — Odysseus’s descent to the realm of the dead — represents something categorically different from the other wandering episodes: a *change of ontological register*. Odysseus does not merely visit a strange place with unusual inhabitants; he crosses the boundary between modes of being. The shades of the dead can speak, but they cannot act; they have knowledge, but they have lost agency.

From the perspective of space exploration, this episode encodes the problem of environments in which *the fundamental categories of existence are different*. In a very deep sense, the conditions of space — microgravity, radiation, the absence of atmosphere, the experience of absolute silence — represent an ontological shift for the human organism. The body that has spent months in space returns to Earth as something partly other than what it was. The *Nekyia* is the mythological analogue of this experience: one can pass through such a boundary and return, but not unchanged.

Tiresias, the blind prophet whom Odysseus specifically seeks in Hades, gives him the information he needs to complete his journey. The knowledge that lies on the far side of the ontological boundary is not available by any other means. This encodes a profound epistemological claim: some truths can only be reached by going to the extreme limit of experience. The astronaut’s knowledge of what the Earth looks like from the Moon is, in this sense, Tiresianic — it comes from having crossed a boundary that most humans cannot cross.

2.3. Circe’s Island: The Transformation of the Explorer

The episode with Circe (Books X–XII) is the poem’s most psychologically complex treatment of the alien encounter’s danger. Circe does not destroy Odysseus’s men; she *transforms* them. They retain their minds but lose their human form and, with it, their human agency. The danger is not death but the loss of identity — the assimilation of the self into the alien environment.

This is precisely one of the two great psychological risks of long-duration space exploration that contemporary research has identified.⁷ The other is Calypso: the

⁶*Odyssey*, IX.364–370. On the philosophical significance of this episode, see Pietro Pucci, *Odysseus Polutropos* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 31–48.

⁷See Nick Kanas and Dietrich Manzey, *Space Psychology and Psychiatry*, 3rd ed. (Chichester: Springer-Praxis, 2017). The psychological literature on “third-quarter phenomenon” and identity dissolution in long-duration spaceflight is directly relevant here.

seduction of *remaining*. If Circe represents involuntary transformation, Calypso (Book V) represents voluntary surrender — the temptation to abandon the nostos and become part of the alien environment permanently. Calypso offers immortality, and Odysseus refuses it. He chooses mortality and return over immortality and remaining. This is one of the most profound choices in Western literature, and its meaning for space exploration is direct: the explorer who does not intend to return has lost the thread of civilization.

2.4. Scylla and Charybdis: Navigation Under Absolute Constraint

The passage between Scylla and Charybdis (Book XII) encodes the challenge of environments in which *any error is fatal* and in which the navigator must choose between two distinct forms of loss — the few (Scylla will take six men) versus the catastrophic (Charybdis will swallow the whole ship). This is not mere adventure narrative. It is a formal problem in decision theory under extreme constraint, with irreversible outcomes.

Circe has provided Odysseus with the relevant information in advance. His survival depends not on physical prowess but on *having listened carefully to someone who knew*. He survives because he prepared, because he received instruction, because he did not approach the passage in ignorance. The lesson for the age of space exploration and AI is unambiguous: the most dangerous environments demand the most rigorous prior knowledge, and the knowledge must be sought from those who possess it, not improvised in the moment.

2.5. The *Polytropos* as Epistemological Ideal

Taken together, these episodes construct a consistent portrait of the ideal explorer. He is not the strongest or the most fearless. He is *πολύτροπος*: he who can *turn many ways*, adapting his mode of engagement to the demands of each environment without losing his fundamental identity. He possesses *μητις* — cunning, adaptive intelligence — which Homer consistently ranks above *βίη* (brute force) as the defining human virtue.⁸

The *Odyssey* is, in this reading, not merely an adventure story but a *manual of adaptive epistemology* for the encounter with the alien. It teaches, through narrative, what no abstract treatise can teach as effectively: how to maintain the integrity of the self while being genuinely open to the transformative power of the radically other.

⁸On the distinction between *metis* and *bie* as structuring principles of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively, see Marcel Detienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1978).

3. Daedalus, Icarus, and the Ambivalence of *Technê*

Δαίδαλος, ὁ τεχνίτης τῶν θεῶν, ὁ πρῶτος εὐρὼν τὴν γλυπτικὴν τέχνην.

Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*, IV.76

If the *Odyssey* encodes the phenomenology of alien-world exploration, the myth of Daedalus and Icarus encodes its *ethics of technology*. And if Ariadne and her thread offer the epistemology of *return*, then together these myths constitute a complete classical philosophy of exploration — one whose pertinence to the present moment is startling in its precision.

3.1. Daedalus: The First Engineer and His Burden

Daedalus (Δαίδαλος: the cunning worker, the elaborately wrought) is the supreme technician of Greek mythology — the figure who stands at the intersection of art, craft, and what we would today call engineering. He builds the Labyrinth for Minos at Knossos, a structure so intricate that its creator himself can barely navigate it. He fashions the wooden cow for Pasiphae. He creates automata of bronze that can move and speak. And, most famously, he constructs wings of feathers and wax by which he and his son Icarus escape their imprisonment on Crete.

What is philosophically significant about Daedalus is not merely his technical virtuosity but his *moral ambiguity*. His creations serve both noble and ignoble ends. The Labyrinth is simultaneously an architectural marvel and a prison. His wings represent both the highest aspiration of the human spirit — to transcend the merely earthly — and the beginning of a tragedy. He is, in short, the first portrait in Western literature of the *morally neutral technician*: the figure whose brilliance is real but whose creations take on lives independent of their maker's intentions.⁹

The application to artificial intelligence is not metaphorical but *precise*. The builders of large language models and artificial general intelligence systems occupy the exact structural position of Daedalus. They have created architectures of extraordinary power and intricacy — labyrinths of attention mechanisms and parameter spaces that their creators cannot fully navigate. And they have released

⁹On Daedalus as a cultural type, see Sarah Morris, *Daedalus and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). Morris's study is indispensable for understanding the mythological complexity of the figure.

creations that, like the wings, serve simultaneously as instruments of liberation and potential engines of catastrophe. Whether those creations will be Icarian depends on questions that cannot be answered within the domain of engineering alone.

3.2. Icarus: *Hubris* and the Physics of the Absolute

Icarus (Ἰκαρος) is the most poignant figure in the entire mythological complex. He is not wicked, not foolish in the ordinary sense. He is young, and he is in possession of an extraordinary power that he has not had the time to internalize as a responsibility. Daedalus gave him the wings and gave him the instructions: do not fly too high, where the sun will melt the wax; do not fly too low, where the sea-spray will weigh down the feathers. Fly the middle course.

But Icarus, intoxicated by flight — by the literal experience of transcendence, of being above the merely earthly — could not hold the middle course. He flew toward the sun. The wax melted. He fell into the sea.

The myth is not a warning against ambition as such. It is a warning against the specific failure to understand that *transcendent power imposes transcendent responsibility*, and that the middle course is not mediocrity but *the highest form of practical wisdom*. What Icarus lacked was not courage or capacity but φρόνησις — practical wisdom, the ability to navigate between extremes while maintaining orientation.¹⁰

The modern space age has had its Icarian moments. The Challenger disaster of 1986 and the Columbia disaster of 2003 are, structurally, Icarian tragedies: in both cases, technically capable systems were pushed beyond their safe operational boundaries by institutional pressures that overwhelmed the practical wisdom of individual engineers who knew better. The engineers were Daedalus figures. The institutions were Icarian.

3.3. The Path Not Taken: Daedalus's Own Flight

There is a detail in the myth that is almost always overlooked but is philosophically crucial: Daedalus *also* flew. He also used the wings. But he survived. He maintained the middle course and arrived safely in Sicily.

The contrast is exact. Same technology. Same physical environment. Same origin point. Different outcome, because of different *wisdom*. The myth is not anti-technological. It is insistently *pro-wisdom*. The question it poses is not “should we build the wings?” but “who should fly them, and with what preparation?”

This is the precise question that the age of AI and space exploration must answer. The technology of large language models, of autonomous systems, of deep

¹⁰Aristotle's analysis of *phronesis* in *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VI, is the obvious reference here. The connection between the Icarus myth and the Aristotelian mean is structurally exact.

space travel — this is the wing-building. The question of who should use these technologies, under what constraints, toward what ends, with what wisdom — this is the question that requires *paideia*, not engineering.

4. Ariadne's Thread: The Philosophy of Return

Ἀριάδνη δὲ τῷ Θησεῖ ἐρασθεῖσα, μίτον ἔδωκεν, ὃν ἐπεὶ ἐν εἰσόδῳ τοῦ
λαβυρίνθου ἔδησεν, ἔχων εἴλε τὸν Μινώταυρον.

Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, III.1.4

In the myth of Theseus, Daedalus's Labyrinth presents the explorer's dilemma in its purest form: a space of enormous complexity into which one must penetrate to encounter the adversary — but from which one cannot return without an external guide. The Labyrinth is, in other words, the *structure of the alien environment itself*: intricate, disorienting, designed to prevent return.

Ariadne's solution — the thread, the μῖτος — is one of the most profound metaphors in all of ancient mythology. It is not a map (which would require prior knowledge of the Labyrinth's structure). It is not a guide (which would require another intelligence within the Labyrinth). It is a *continuous connection to the origin point* — an unbroken line linking the explorer, wherever he is within the alien structure, to the threshold from which he entered.

4.1. The Thread as Epistemic Lifeline

The thread does not tell Theseus where he is. It does not illuminate the Labyrinth. It does not show him the Minotaur or explain how to fight it. It does only one thing, but that one thing is everything: it ensures that *wherever he goes and whatever he encounters, the path home exists*.

This is, philosophically, a theory of the *preservation of identity through radical displacement*. The explorer enters the alien environment as a particular person, with a particular history, a particular set of commitments and relationships. The Labyrinth — like deep space, like the alien encounter, like immersion in a sufficiently advanced AI system — has the power to dissolve those commitments through disorientation and transformation. The thread is the philosopher's answer to this dissolution: maintain the connection, and you can always return to yourself.

4.2. Ariadne as Philosophy Itself

The figure of Ariadne in this context carries a specific philosophical charge. She is the one who *knows the structure* of the Labyrinth — not because she built it (that was her father's commission to Daedalus) but because she understands the mind of its

builder. Her knowledge is not technical but *meta-technical*: she understands what the technology is designed to do and therefore knows what is needed to survive it.

This is precisely the role that classical philosophy and humanistic *paideia* play in relation to technology. The engineer builds the Labyrinth. The philosopher holds the thread. Neither alone is sufficient: without the engineer, there is no structure to enter; without the philosopher, there is no return. The catastrophic error of the modern age has been to valorize the engineer and dismiss the philosopher — to build ever more intricate labyrinths while cutting the thread.

4.3. The Return as Transformation

It is essential to note that the return enabled by Ariadne's thread is not a return to the *same* state. Theseus returns from the Labyrinth having killed the Minotaur — having confronted and transformed what was monstrous at the center of the structure. The thread enables return, but the return is the return of someone who has genuinely been through the alien and *brought something back*.

This is the complete structure of the explorer's journey, as the Greeks understood it. Not the Icarian flight that ends in the sea. Not the Calypso-temptation that ends in remaining. But the Ariadne-pattern: penetrate the alien fully, encounter what is at its center, and return transformed, carrying knowledge that was not available from outside.

The astronaut who has seen the Earth from space and returned carries this Ariadne-knowledge. The philosopher who has genuinely inhabited a radically different intellectual tradition and returned to their own carries it. The researcher in artificial intelligence who has built a system capable of genuine reasoning and come back to reflect on what it means for human self-understanding carries it. This is the knowledge that classical *paideia* trained one to seek, to bear, and to integrate.

5. Stoic Cosmopolitanism and the Overview Effect

Ἄνωθεν ὄρα τὰς μυριάδας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὰς μυριάδας τῶν
δαιμόνων, καὶ πάσας τὰς σπουδὰς τούτων, καὶ τὰς συνουσίας, καὶ
τὰς πολλὰς ταύτας φύσεις.

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, VII.48

The Stoics developed the Greek intuition of cosmic kinship into a systematic political philosophy. Their doctrine of κοσμοπολιτισμός — cosmopolitanism, citizenship of the cosmos — was not a vague aspiration but a precise philosophical claim: the wise person's primary political identity is their membership in the universal rational community of all beings who possess λόγος.¹¹

5.1. Marcus Aurelius and the Cosmic View

Marcus Aurelius returns obsessively in the *Meditations* to the exercise of *viewing from above* (ἄνωθεν ὄρᾶν): imagining oneself looking down at the human world from a cosmic vantage-point and seeing its wars, its ambitions, its grievances, and its passions as they appear against the backdrop of astronomical time and space.

“Look down from above on the countless herds of men and their countless rites and ceremonies, and their manifold voyagings in stormy weather and calm, and the various vicissitudes of those who are born, live together, and die. And consider, too, the life lived by others in olden time, and the life that will be lived after thee, and the life that is lived now among barbarous nations; and how many know not even thy name, and how many will soon forget it, and how many who now perhaps are loud in thy praise will very soon be blaming thee.” (*Meditations*, IX.30)

This exercise — the deliberate cultivation of the cosmic perspective as a remedy for the parochialism and tribalism that generate conflict — is now available not merely as a philosophical practice but as a *literal experience*. The astronaut who looks down at the Earth from orbit undergoes what researchers have termed the *Overview Effect*: a documented cognitive and emotional transformation in which the arbitrary divisions of human conflict — national borders, political grievances,

¹¹On Stoic cosmopolitanism, see Malcolm Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and more recently Eric Brown, “Hellenistic Cosmopolitanism,” in *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, ed. Mary Louise Gill and Pierre Pellegrin (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), pp. 549–558.

ethnic identities — become invisible or insignificant against the reality of a single fragile biosphere.¹²

5.2. The Stoic Argument for Space Exploration

From the Stoic standpoint, the Overview Effect is not a mere psychological curiosity. It is the *empirical confirmation* of what the Stoic philosophical practice was designed to produce through contemplation alone. Marcus Aurelius could only imagine looking down from above. The astronaut has done it. And the consistent testimony of those who have had this experience — that they returned to Earth transformed, with a sense of planetary identity and a deep unease with the petty conflicts of terrestrial politics — is precisely what the Stoic tradition predicted.

This yields a Stoic argument for space exploration that is entirely distinct from the familiar utilitarian arguments (resources, redundancy, scientific knowledge). The Stoic argument is *moral and political*: a civilization that wishes to transcend the tribalism, nationalism, and parochialism that generate wars should invest in providing as many of its citizens as possible with the literal experience of the Overview Effect. The overview is not merely a view. It is a form of philosophical *paideia* delivered by the universe itself.

5.3. Thucydides contra the Stoics: The Warning

Against this Stoic optimism, we must set Thucydides. The historian of the Peloponnesian War was under no illusions about the power of the cosmic perspective to transform political behavior. His Athenians were, arguably, the most philosophically sophisticated political actors of antiquity. They also perpetrated the Melian massacre.

The Thucydidean warning is this: *πλεονεξία* — the insatiable desire for more — is not a superficial feature of human political organization that can be dissolved by education or perspective. It is a deep structural tendency rooted in the competitive dynamics of power between states. The space race between the United States and China is not conducted under the sign of Stoic cosmopolitanism. It is conducted under the sign of Thucydides: strategic advantage, resource acquisition, prestige, and the logic of the security dilemma.¹³

¹²The term was coined and the phenomenon first systematically described by Frank White in *The Overview Effect: Space Exploration and Human Evolution*, 3rd ed. (Reston, VA: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2014). The philosophical resonances with Stoic practice have been noted but not fully developed.

¹³The “Thucydides Trap” — the structural tendency toward war when a rising power challenges an established one — has been extensively discussed in contemporary strategic studies. See Graham Allison, *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides’s Trap?* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2017).

The Greek synthesis, then, requires holding both Stoic aspiration and Thucydidean realism in productive tension. Space exploration can be the vehicle of the Overview Effect — of genuine civilizational maturation. But it can also be the Aegean writ large: the same competition for dominance, now extended into the heavens. The outcome depends not on the technology of the spacecraft but on the *quality of the civilization* that builds and uses them.

6. Aristotle's Teleological Challenge

ἐπεὶ δ' ὁρῶμεν ὅτι πᾶσα πόλις κοινωνία τίς ἐστι καὶ πᾶσα κοινωνία
ἀγαθοῦ τινος ἔνεκεν συνέστηκεν.

Aristotle, *Politics*, I.1, 1252a1

Aristotle would approach the question of space exploration with characteristic methodological caution. Before asking how to explore, he would insist on asking why. The *Politics* opens with the claim that every human community is organized for the sake of some good. The *Nicomachean Ethics* opens with the observation that every art, inquiry, action, and pursuit aims at some good. The question τί τὸ τέλος; — what is the purpose? — is for Aristotle the logically prior question that must be answered before any practical undertaking can be rationally evaluated.

6.1. The Teleological Questions

Applied to space exploration, the Aristotelian questions are concrete:

- Does this exploration serve human εὐδαιμονία — flourishing — or merely human πλεονεξία — the desire for more?
- Does it serve the flourishing of all human beings, or of a particular faction within humanity (a nation, a corporation, a class of billionaires)?
- Does the knowledge gained by exploration contribute to the θεωρία — contemplative understanding — that is the highest form of human activity, or does it serve only instrumental ends?
- Does the institutional structure of the space program exhibit the virtues of practical wisdom and justice, or does it exhibit the vices of hubris and pleonexia?

Aristotle would not *oppose* space exploration on the basis of these questions. He would simply insist that these questions must be answered, and answered honestly, before the enterprise can claim the status of a genuinely civilizational project rather than a sophisticated form of interstate competition.

6.2. The Aristotelian Critique of the Billionaire Space Race

Here the Aristotelian analysis has particular contemporary bite. The private space ventures of the early twenty-first century — SpaceX, Blue Origin, and their imitators — are organized around a vision of space exploration that is, in Aristotelian

terms, profoundly confused about its own telos. The billionaire space entrepreneurs present their projects as civilizational — as the salvation of humanity, the expansion of life into the cosmos. But the organizational structure and the actual decision-making of these enterprises reflects the logic of corporate competition and personal aggrandizement.

Aristotle would note: the *city* — the political community — exists for the good life, not merely for life.¹⁴ An enterprise that promises to extend life into space while declining to ensure the good life for those who remain on Earth has confused its means and ends in a characteristically Icarian fashion.

6.3. De Caelo and the Nature of the Heavens

Aristotle's cosmology differs fundamentally from the modern in ways that are philosophically instructive. In *De Caelo*, he argues that the heavens are composed of a fifth element — αἰθήρ (aether) — distinct from the four sublunary elements, incapable of generation or corruption, naturally disposed to eternal circular motion.¹⁵ The superlunary world is perfect, eternal, and not subject to the contingency and decay that characterize earthly existence.

This cosmology is, of course, empirically false. But it encodes a philosophically important intuition: that the transition from the terrestrial to the celestial involves a change of *kind*, not merely of degree. The attitude appropriate to the terrestrial world — practical intervention, manipulation, exploitation of resources — is not straightforwardly appropriate to the celestial. The heavens deserve a different form of attention: contemplation rather than conquest.

¹⁴Aristotle, *Politics*, I.2, 1252b30: γίνεται μὲν οὖν τοῦ ζῆν ἕνεκεν, ἔστι δὲ τοῦ εὖ ζῆν.

¹⁵Aristotle, *De Caelo*, I.2–3, 268b26–270b31.

7. Classical *Paideia* in the Age of AI: Why the Greeks Are Not Optional

ἀρετὴ δὲ ἔοικε τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς χωρίοις· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ πονηροὺς καρποφορεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἀγαθοὺς ποιεῖ ἀγαθοτέρους.

Plutarch, *How a Young Man Should Study Poetry*, 15D

We have argued that the *Odyssey* encodes the phenomenology of alien-world exploration, that the Daedalus-Icarus myth encodes the ethics of technology, and that the Ariadne myth encodes the philosophy of return. We have situated these arguments within the broader Greek cosmological framework that sees the cosmos as a rational home rather than a hostile void. We have set Stoic optimism and Thucydidean realism in productive tension. Now we must ask the practical question that gives this monograph its ultimate purpose: what does all of this mean for the present moment — the age of artificial general intelligence and renewed space exploration?

Our answer is direct: classical *paideia* is not ornamental for such an age. It is *architectonic*. Without it, the age of AI and space exploration will be Icarian — brilliant, briefly transcendent, and ultimately catastrophic.

7.1. What *Paideia* Is

Παιδεία — *paideia* — is notoriously difficult to translate. Werner Jaeger’s three-volume study remains the definitive account of its meaning and scope.¹⁶ It is not *education* in the modern sense — the transmission of a curriculum of informational content. It is, rather, the *formation of the whole person*: the cultivation of intellectual virtues, moral character, aesthetic sensibility, and the capacity for political judgment. Its goal is καλοκαγαθία — the beautiful and the good united in a single human life.

Paideia works by exposure to great exemplars — great texts, great arguments, great lives — and by the disciplined practice of engaging with them seriously: not as historical curiosities but as live interlocutors capable of challenging and transforming the student’s existing beliefs. It is, in essence, the practice of taking seriously the possibility that someone who lived two thousand years ago understood something important that we have forgotten.

¹⁶Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols., trans. Gilbert Highet (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939–1944).

7.2. The Specific Contributions of Classical *Paideia* to the AI Age

The contributions are multiple and specific:

I. First-principles thinking. The Greek philosophical tradition is, above all, a tradition of asking *why* before asking *how*. The Socratic method is the institutionalization of this discipline: the refusal to accept any claim as established until its foundations have been examined. In an age when AI systems are deployed at scale before their implications are understood, and when space programs are launched before their political and ethical frameworks are secured, this habit of first-principles interrogation is not a luxury but a survival requirement.

II. The grammar of *hubris* and *nemesis*. The Greek tragic tradition developed over several centuries an extraordinarily refined analysis of the psychological and political dynamics by which great power, unchecked by wisdom, generates its own destruction. The concepts of ὕβρις (*hubris*: transgression of proper limits, usually through excess of pride or power) and νέμεσις (*nemesis*: the structural response of reality to *hubris*) are not mere moralism. They are, as Bernard Williams argued, a sophisticated account of the relationship between excellence, excess, and catastrophe.¹⁷ The AI safety community has reinvented much of this analysis in the language of systems theory and game theory. It would benefit from reading Sophocles.

III. The theory of *phronesis*. Aristotle's concept of φρόνησις — practical wisdom, the capacity to perceive the morally relevant features of a particular situation and to deliberate well about what to do — is precisely what AI systems currently lack and cannot acquire by training on data alone.¹⁸ The question of how to deploy AI systems in contexts that require moral judgment — medical triage, legal decision-making, military targeting — is precisely the question of how to supply, from outside the system, the *phronesis* that the system itself cannot possess. This requires humans who have been trained in *phronesis* — and that training is what classical *paideia* provides.

¹⁷Bernard Williams, *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), chapters 3–5. Williams's recovery of the Greek tragic vocabulary as a serious moral psychology remains essential.

¹⁸This point has been argued with philosophical rigor by Hubert Dreyfus from a phenomenological perspective in *What Computers Can't Do* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972) and its successor *What Computers Still Can't Do* (1992). The Aristotelian analysis of *phronesis* as embodied, contextual, and non-algorithmic is directly relevant.

IV. Cosmological humility. Perhaps the deepest contribution of the Greek tradition to the present moment is its insistence on the *finitude of human knowledge* in the face of an infinite cosmos. The Socratic recognition that wisdom begins with the knowledge of one's own ignorance — οἶδα ὅτι οὐδὲν οἶδα in the proverbial formulation — is not intellectual diffidence. It is the prerequisite for genuine inquiry. A civilization that approaches space and AI with the *hubris* of certainty — that it knows what these systems and these environments will do — is already repeating Icarus's flight.

7.3. The Danger of Technological Solutionism

There is a specific danger that the Greek tradition is uniquely positioned to diagnose and resist: the belief that the problems of human civilization are, at bottom, technological problems requiring technological solutions. This belief — call it technological solutionism — is structurally identical to the error that the *Odyssey* dramatizes in the episode of the Cyclops. The Cyclops is technologically impressive: his size, his strength, his stone-rolling capacity vastly exceed anything a human can do physically. But he has no *logos* in its social dimension. He cannot negotiate, cannot honor obligations, cannot sustain the institutions that make collective life possible and good.

The civilization that builds ever more powerful AI systems and ever more capable spacecraft while neglecting the cultivation of the human capacities for wisdom, judgment, and civilizational self-governance is, in the deepest sense, a Cyclopean civilization. Impressive, powerful, and profoundly vulnerable to the kind of cleverness that Odysseus applies — the cleverness, that is, of adversaries who understand the limits of raw power better than its possessors do.

8. The Name That Should Have Been: A Note on Athena

Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, θυγάτηρ Διός, ἥ τε καὶ ἀντὶ βουλέων ξύμβουλος
καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἔργων.

Hesiod, *Theogony*, 896–897

A brief digression, but a philosophically important one. The American space program that is currently working toward the return of humans to the Moon has been named *Artemis*. This choice is transparently motivated by demographic symbolism: Artemis as the first program to land a woman on the lunar surface, hence a goddess.

The choice is, from a classical perspective, a significant error. Artemis is a goddess of the hunt, of wild nature, of the untamed terrestrial — and while she carries the crescent moon as an occasional attribute, this is entirely incidental to her essential nature and mythological function. She is chthonic, not celestial. She is a goddess of *the hunt*, not of *the journey*. She is, of all the Olympians, among the least relevant to a project of rational exploration of the cosmos.

Athena (Ἀθηνᾶ Παλλὰς) would be the correct choice on every dimension:

- She is born from the *mind of Zeus* — she is pure νοῦς, pure intelligence, untouched by irrational passion. Space exploration at its best is the highest expression of human rational intelligence.
- She is the patron of τέχνη in its highest form — not mere craft but the union of technical skill, intellectual rigor, and ethical purpose. The engineering required for deep space exploration is Athena's domain, not Artemis's.
- She is, crucially, *the guardian of Odysseus*. She is the divine intelligence that accompanies the polytropos through every alien environment and ensures his return. If the *Odyssey* is the ur-narrative of space exploration, then Athena is its presiding deity.
- She is the patron of *the city* — of civilizational order, of the institutions that make collective rational life possible. The question of how to govern space exploration wisely is, precisely, an Athenaic question.

- She is a warrior, but one who wins through intelligence rather than force. This is the ideal disposition for a space-faring civilization: capable of decisive action, but guided by wisdom rather than mere power.

The choice of Artemis over Athena is symptomatic of a broader tendency in contemporary culture: the preference for aesthetic and demographic symbolism over substantive intellectual content. Artemis is a goddess with cultural visibility and demographic relevance. Athena is the goddess most fitted to the actual purpose of the enterprise. That the latter was not chosen tells us something important about the civilization that is attempting to return to the Moon.

9. Synthesis: The Triad of Exploration

We are now in a position to draw together the threads of the argument — and the metaphor of the thread is, of course, not accidental.

The Greek mythological and philosophical tradition, read in the light of the contemporary challenges of space exploration and artificial intelligence, yields a coherent triad of principles for the wise civilization:

I. Πολυτροπία — Polytrophy: Adaptive Intelligence as the Epistemology of the Alien

The Odyssean virtue of turning many ways, of adapting one's mode of engagement to the demands of each new environment without losing one's fundamental identity, is the core epistemological virtue for the explorer of alien environments. It requires *genuine openness* to the alien — a willingness to discover that one's existing categories do not apply — combined with the *preservation of identity* that makes return possible. Neither pure assimilation (Calypso) nor mere domination (the Cyclops approach) is adequate. The polytropos alone can navigate without losing the thread.

II. Μῖτος — The Thread: The Philosophy of Return

Ariadne's thread is not merely a navigational device. It is the philosophical commitment to *return and integration*: the insistence that exploration is not complete until the knowledge gained in the alien environment has been brought back and integrated into the civilization from which the explorer departed. The thread encodes the *obligation to the community* that sends the explorer and to which the explorer owes the fruits of the journey. Space exploration that does not return — that colonizes the heavens to escape the Earth rather than to enrich it — has cut the thread. It is no longer Theseian. It is, at best, Calypso. At worst, Icarian.

III. Νοῦς — Deep Rationality: The Athenaic Dimension

Neither adaptive intelligence nor the preservation of return is sufficient without the third element: the deep rational intelligence, the νοῦς, that Athena represents in her divine form and that *paideia* cultivates in its human form. This is the capacity not merely to adapt to environments or to maintain the thread of identity, but to *understand* — to achieve genuine *theoria*, the contemplative vision that sees the cosmos as it truly is and acts accordingly. It is this capacity that distinguishes the Daedalus figure who survives from the Icarus figure who falls: not a difference in

technical capacity but a difference in the depth of rational self-understanding that governs the use of that capacity.

These three principles — polytropy, the thread, and deep rationality — constitute the classical answer to the civilizational challenges of the present moment. They are not slogans. They are each the condensed distillate of centuries of Greek philosophical reflection on what it means to venture beyond the known and return wiser rather than merely older.

Conclusion: Delphi Before the Launch Pad

γνῶθι σεαυτόν· μηδὲν ἄγαν.

The Two Delphic Maxims

We end where the argument began: with the Delphic oracle, whose two maxims — *know thyself* and *nothing in excess* — constitute the most concentrated classical wisdom about the human condition in all of antiquity.

Γνῶθι σεαυτόν — *know thyself* — is not a counsel of introspection for its own sake. In its Delphic context, it means: know what kind of being you are. Know your capacities and your limits. Know that you are mortal, finite, and fallible, and that the hubris that forgets this finitude is the precondition of catastrophe. Know what you actually understand as opposed to what you merely believe you understand. Know, in short, what Socrates knew: that wisdom begins with the recognition of ignorance.

Μηδὲν ἄγαν — *nothing in excess* — is the formalization of *phronesis* as a negative constraint: whatever you do, do not push it beyond the proper measure. Not because excellence is to be avoided, but because excellence carried past its proper limit becomes its own destruction. Daedalus flying at the right altitude: μηδὲν ἄγαν. Icarus flying toward the sun: its violation.

The age of artificial general intelligence and renewed space exploration is an age in which *both* Delphic maxims are under severe pressure. The machines that have been built do not know themselves — they have no self to know. The civilizations building them have not paused to examine whether they know themselves well enough to be building them. And the ambition driving both the AI race and the space race is *by definition* an ambition that risks forgetting the second maxim: the drive to be first, to be biggest, to be most powerful, to go further and faster and higher than any predecessor.

The Greeks would not tell us to stop. They would tell us to think. They would tell us that the Labyrinth has been entered, and that what matters now is whether we hold the thread. They would remind us that the wings have been put on, and that the choice between Daedalus's altitude and Icarus's altitude is made in the mind before it is made in the air.

And they would tell us, above all, that the stars beyond Ithaca were always there — that the *Odyssey* knew about them before we had rockets to reach them

— and that the poem’s deepest lesson is not about adventure but about *return*: the return to Ithaca, to the community, to the self, to the Earth that remains, for all the excellence of the journey, the only home that can be *known* in the full Delphic sense.

The cosmos calls — but Delphi speaks first.

References

- Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Apollodorus. *Bibliotheca*. Trans. J.G. Frazer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. *De Caelo*. Trans. J.L. Stocks. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. J. Barnes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. T. Irwin. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1999.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Trans. C.D.C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998.
- Brown, E. (2006). "Hellenistic Cosmopolitanism." In *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, ed. M.L. Gill and P. Pellegrin, pp. 549–558. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cornford, F.M. (1937). *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato Translated with Running Commentary*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.P. (1978). *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. Trans. C.H. Oldfather. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Dreyfus, H. (1972). *What Computers Can't Do: A Critique of Artificial Reason*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Dreyfus, H. (1992). *What Computers Still Can't Do: A Critique of Artificial Reason*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heraclitus. Fragments. In H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1952. [DK 22]
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. Trans. M.L. West. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Homer. *Odyssey*. Trans. E.V. Rieu, rev. D.C.H. Rieu. London: Penguin, 2003.

- Jaeger, W. (1939–1944). *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols. Trans. G. Highet. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kahn, C.H. (1979). *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kanas, N. and Manzey, D. (2017). *Space Psychology and Psychiatry*, 3rd ed. Chichester: Springer-Praxis.
- Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations*. Trans. G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1983.
- Morris, S.P. (1992). *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Trans. W.H.S. Jones. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Plato. *Phaedrus*. Trans. C.J. Rowe. London: Penguin, 2005.
- Plato. *Republic*. Trans. G.M.A. Grube, rev. C.D.C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992.
- Plato. *Timaeus*. Trans. D.J. Zeyl. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000.
- Pucci, P. (1987). *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sagan, C. (1994). *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space*. New York: Random House.
- Schofield, M. (1991). *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Trans. R. Warner. London: Penguin, 1972.
- White, F. (2014). *The Overview Effect: Space Exploration and Human Evolution*, 3rd ed. Reston, VA: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.
- Williams, B. (1993). *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.



Cybernetics and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory (CAIL)

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

2026