

was also that the New York case allowed
not only ~~that~~ the beneficiary to be
identified by parol evidence but allowed
the trust to be proven in some manner.
This is entirely illogical. How you have
two things to prove instead of one.
If the Court will not allow the beneficiary
to be identified by a subsequent writing or
parol evidence, they should certainly
not allow both the trust and the
identity of C to be shown by parol evidence.