

[< Back](#)

Larger context for **HOWEVER**

Clear words were a matter of practical rather than juridical significance they were not the essential constitutive element in trusts but invaluable evidence as to the intentions at law of the settlor. That this is the correct interpretation of the role of words in trusts emerges more clearly in the next section.

INDIRECT DISPOSITIONS The last section considered how the jurists interpreted the wordings of dispositions and determined whether they constituted trusts. But it dealt only with wordings addressed to trustees, requesting them or otherwise encouraging them to pass property on to beneficiaries. There are cases, **however**, in which the trustee is not addressed with a request, or in which no words purporting to constitute a trust are used at all. The question arises how these would be interpreted. This section examines cases which use indirect words, words directed to someone other than the trustee, which are none the less held to give rise to an obligation under trust in the trustee. Paul's *sententiae* provide a convenient starting point.