

# How can writing a will be justified in Epicureanism?

Post by "wbernys" of February 5, 2026 at 4:28 AM

A strong objection to Epicurus found in Cicero and discovered in Warren (2001): *Epicurus' Dying Wishes* is that writing a will, and providing for people after die, such as Diogene of Oenoanda stone writings cannot be justified with Epicurus claim that "[death is nothing to us](#)".

In particular Warren objects to the notion that we can derive pleasure from thinking that our loved ones will be okay after we die since this would arguably also admit that we can anticipate pain about things after we die which Epicurus seems to call groundless saying in letter to Menoeceus saying "For something that causes no trouble when present causes only a groundless pain when merely expected."

My own response would probably be that it is in fact groundless, agreeing with the criticism, but saying that if writing a will delivers pleasure and alleviates the natural pain of worry about loved ones after death, offering no pain to living and requiring little effort than why not? Just as we know sex, entertainment, and other natural and unnessecary desires don't alleviate any more pain after sastifying all the natural and nessecary desires but if we still want them and are easy to get and cause no pain than why not? The reason we get rid of post-mortem fears is because they pain us while alive, but if post-mortem hopes please us than it's fine to have it and it passes the hedonistic calculus despite being metaphysically groundless like the natural and unnecessary desires.

Curious to see any thoughts on this.