A character named MALTESE CROSS has long been encoded in the Dingbats range at U+2720 (⹓). It is not, however, actually a Maltese cross, but rather a cross patty, also known as a cross pattée, cross formy, cross formée, or croix pattée. (The name derives from French patte ‘a foot or paw’, and refers to the shape of the foot of a chalice or candelabrum.) A Maltese cross consists of four arrowhead shaped concave quadrilaterals converging at a central vertex at right angles, the two tips pointing outward symmetrically. This is very distinct from the cross patty. (The Maltese cross itself derives from a different source than the cross patty, namely the cross moline, whose ends resemble a millrind, the iron clamp of the upper millstone.) The existing character’s name cannot be changed, and its glyph is too well-established to be changed either. Here is the current entry, informative note, and cross reference:

⹓ 2720 MALTESE CROSS
• historically, the Maltese cross took many forms; the shape shown in the Zapf Dingbats is similar to one known as the Cross Formée
x 1F902 circled cross formee

This informative note is not really accurate. The Maltese cross had various forms, but none of them was the cross patty. In order to remedy this error, the UCS should encode a genuine Maltese cross, since the character name of U+2720 has doubtless led users to expect to be able to use one. The reason glyph variation should not continue to be permitted is outlined below.

A full cross patty ⌉ and two half crosses patty ⌈ and ⌋ have been discovered as characters used inline in an important Middle Scots translation of John Purvey’s 1388 revision of Wycliffe’s Middle English New Testament, made by Murdoch Nisbet c. 1520 and published by the Scottish Text Society in three volumes in 1901, 1903, and 1905. The original manuscript for this is held in the British Library, Egerton MS 2880. In this manuscript the three kinds of crosses are carefully drawn throughout the work, along with U+204C ⨇ BLACK LEFTWARDS BULLET; all of these are represented in type in Law’s 1901–05 edition of Nisbet’s translation. This New Testament is a historically interesting Middle Scots textual source—in that the pre-Reformation translation was illegal at the time—and it is linguistically interesting in that there are very few texts offering direct comparison between Middle English and Middle Scots. Because of this Nisbet’s textual apparatus must be representable in the UCS, and this suggests a proper disunification of U+2720 into two distinct characters.
Currently, either the shape \(\times\) or the shape \(\star\) can be used for U+2720, though it appears that very few fonts use the latter shape. The two crosses should be disunified and encoded separately because (firstly) the unification is simply the result of a mistaken character name, not of a principled decision to unify the cross patty and the Maltese cross, and because (secondly), the half crosses do not (and should not) have Maltese-cross shapes. The following three additions are proposed here:

- 2E50 CROSS PATTY WITH RIGHT CROSSBAR
  - x 2720 maltese cross
- 2E51 CROSS FORMY WITH LEFT CROSSBAR
- 2E52 CROSS OF MALTA
  - this is the genuine maltese cross
  - x 2720 maltese cross
  - x 1F902 circled cross formee

I have not encountered these half-crosses in other texts, but it seems unlikely that Nisbet invented them. In general the \(\times\) tends to begin a section or subsection of text and the \(\star\) form tends to end one; \(\times\) seems to be used at the beginning of more major sections.

The original misnomer should be rectified with the following annotations:

- 2720 MALTESE CROSS
  - • cross patty, cross pattée, cross formy, cross formée
  - • character name is a misnomer
  - x 2E50 cross patty with right crossbar
  - x 2E51 cross patty with left crossbar
  - x 2E52 cross of malta
  - x 1F902 circled cross formee

1. Discussion.
The characters in the U-2700 block are all dingbats, encoded because Zapf Dingbats were built into early laser-printers. It isn’t all that easy to find any of these characters used “inline in text”, either before or after their encoding in the UCS. Many users have used U+2720 with its cross patty shape as a Maltese cross; of all the fonts on my own machine which have this character (most of which are CJK or Korean fonts), only the Code 2000 by James Kass (dated 2003) has an actual Maltese-cross shape. Figures 9 and 10 below show instances of dissatisfaction on the part of \TeX\ users due to the unification of the cross patty with the Maltese cross and Figure 11 shows some general discussion about Maltese crosses as found in Malta, noting that its salient feature is its eight points.

2. Character Names.
The Norman forms cross patty and cross pattée are the most common terms in English heraldry, and the former has been used for these characters because the accent cannot be represented in UCS character
names in English. The UCS does already contain U+1F902 CIRCLED CROSS FORMEE, unfortunately misspelt without the acute accent on *formée*. I have preferred the anglicized form CROSS PATTY here, though CROSS FORMEE could be used if consistency in this matter were considered to be desirable.

3. Unicode Character Properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Point</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2E50</td>
<td>CROSS PATTY WITH RIGHT CROSSBAR</td>
<td>So;0;ON;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E51</td>
<td>CROSS PATTY WITH LEFT CROSSBAR</td>
<td>So;0;ON;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E52</td>
<td>CROSS OF MALTA</td>
<td>So;0;ON;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Figures

![Facsimile of Egerton MS 2880 f. 105 v.](image)

*Figure 1.* Facsimile of Egerton MS 2880 f. 105 v., showing the CROSS PATTY WITH RIGHT CROSSBAR in line 10 following the text “[Wit]neſſing is trew” and preceding the text “And þar ar alfa mony vþ thingis” (Law 1901:frontispiece).
Figure 2. Transcription of Egerton MS 2880 f. 105 v., John 21:20–25, showing the CROSS PATTY WITH RIGHT CROSSBAR at the end of verse 24 (Law 1903:83). It has been coloured red here and in Figure 3 for clarity, though in the printed book it is shown in black.

Figure 3. Transcription of Egerton MS 2880, Matthew 21:19–37, showing the CROSS PATTY WITH RIGHT CROSSBAR at the end of verse 22 and at the beginning of verse 28, the already-encoded MALTESE CROSS at the beginning of verses 23 and 33, and in the middle of verse 28 (where it begins a parable), and the CROSS PATTY WITH LEFT CROSSBAR at the end of verse 32. (Law 1901:90–91).
Figure 4. Description of the MALTESE CROSS and the CROSS PATTY and some other heraldic crosses (Boutell 1889:57).

Figure 5. Description of the Maltese cross and the cross patty and some other heraldic crosses (Brooke-Little 1985:77). Note the cross moline to the left of the Maltese cross; this is the genuine precursor and ancestor of the Maltese cross.
Figure 6. Description of the Maltese cross and the cross patty and some other heraldic crosses (Friar 1987:121). Note the cross moline proper at the top of the image.

Figure 7. A St John Ambulance Maltese Cross, which was the first object to be transmitted as an image in early television experiments by John Logie Baird, in 1924. It belonged to John Logie Baird's doctor, Dr George Locke, who was based a short distance from the inventor's workshop. Baird initially used a cardboard cross to create shadowgraphs but he needed an object that would reflect the light. The shiny enamel surface and contrasting colours of this medal was ideal and it became the first object to be transmitted as an image. From http://www.bbc.co.uk/ahistoryoftheworld/objects/VbfAHSiBSbam_lloQvajCA.

It is not a cross patty. It is a major iconic cross in its own right.
Figure 8. Examples of the cross patty in use in text (Lee 1875:142).

Figure 9. Description of the Maltese cross on a popular mathematics website. The text points out that the cross pattée is “incorrectly” called a Maltese cross. The unification is not satisfactory to users of a genuine Maltese cross.

From http://mathworld.wolfram.com/MalteseCross.html
Figure 10. Discussion of the problem a \TeX user had because of the mistaken unification of the Maltese cross and the cross patty. The text points out that the two differ “both in terms of appearance and signification”.

From https://tex.stackexchange.com/questions/202746/how-to-draw-an-actual-maltese-cross
Figure 11. General descriptions of the Maltese cross with examples of its shape in Malta. From https://www.ottsworld.com/blogs/maltese-cross-pictures/
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