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ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra* (1836-1842) by British Architect Owen Jones in relation to British conceptions of Spain in the nineteenth century. Although modern scholars often view Jones's work as an accurate visual account of the Alhambra, I argue that his work is not only interested in accuracy, but it is also a re-presentation of the fourteen-century monument based on Jones's ideologies and creative faculties. Instead of viewing the Alhambra through a culturally sensitive, historical lens, Jones treated it as an Imaginary Geography, as Edward Said called it, through which he could promote his interests and perspectives.

Although there were many British views of Spain in nineteenth-century, this thesis will focus on two sets of seemingly contradictory conceptions of Spain that were especially important to Jones’s visual and ideological program in *Alhambra: Spain’s status as both the Catholic and Islamic Other, and its frequent interpretations through both romantic and reform-oriented lenses. Through a closer look at *Arabian Antiquities of Spain* by James Cavanah Murphy and the illustrations from *The Tourist in Spain: Granada* by David Roberts, I show the prevalence of these mindsets in nineteenth-century reconstructions of the Alhambra. Then, I compare portions of these works to plates from Jones’s *Alhambra* to illustrate Jones’s similar adaptation of these perspectives despite the visual peculiarity of his work as a whole.
INTRODUCTION

Modern scholars herald *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra* (1836-1842) by architect Owen Jones (1809-1874) as a scholarly treatise on the Alhambra in an era when most representations of the monument transformed it according to European perspectives. Scholars argue that while his contemporaries were re-imagining the Alhambra based on nineteenth-century principles, Jones was creating a comprehensive two-volume book that transcended the values of his time.¹ Indeed, Jones and his partner, French architect Jules Goury (1803-1834) took great care to faithfully reconstruct the medieval monument in print. In 1834, Jones and Goury traveled together to Spain, residing in the Alhambra for six months to study its architectural ornament at great length.² These men produced detailed drawings, made rubbings, and even studied traces of paint found in the surviving ornamental schemes to create the most comprehensive visual and textual survey of the monument possible. In his *Alhambra*, Jones illustrated for his readers ornamental and architectural themes from all over the Alhambra palace. He included comprehensive translations of Arabic inscriptions and detailed descriptions of his images to give readers a broad understanding of the architectural program of the medieval monument. To further extend his study, Jones created a second volume in which he visually elaborated, to an even greater degree, upon the ornamentation of the Alhambra (see figure

---

² Jones would return to the Alhambra in 1837 to reexamine several features of the Alhambra for forthcoming plates.
1). When compiled, Jones’s plates and descriptions fill two volumes. His work is written in both English and French and contains one hundred and three plates, fifty-seven pages of description and Arabic translations, and a twenty-page history of Granada, Spain.

Despite the breadth and meticulousness of Jones’s *Alhambra*, his work is not only interested in accuracy, but it is also a product of his ideologies and creative faculties.3 Scholars who view Jones’s *Alhambra* as a precise account divorced from nineteenth-century British attitudes toward Spain underrate the relationship between Jones’s *Alhambra* and the works of his contemporaries. Further, they create a sharp divide in his career. While several of his later endeavors, including the *Grammar of Ornament* (1856), are regarded as intimately connected to contemporary ideologies, the work of his earlier career is thought to rise above the preconceptions of his peers.4 The major productions of his early and later career are almost never discussed in concert at great length because of this discrepancy. In an effort to extrapolate deeper meaning from Jones’s *Alhambra*, and create more congruity between his early and late career, I argue that this book was not an objective report on the monument, but an interpretation of the Alhambra based on multifarious British conceptions of Spain’s Otherness and historic status.5

3 Jones’s attempt at accuracy should not be confused with its realization. To create an entirely "accurate" reconstruction of a monument would be impossible as "reconstruction" inherently implies the use of imaginative, creative faculties.


5 The impulse to reject the notion of Jones’s objectivity comes from an acceptance of postmodern philosophy as a means to understand the creation of art and literature. If I accept that Jones could create an objective report of the Alhambra, because he somehow understood the monument more completely than his peers, I am in danger of legitimizing metanarratives. For more on the delegitimization of metanarratives see Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report*
Scholars began to characterize Jones’s *Alhambra* as less value-laden than contemporaneous works in the earliest era of scholarship on Jones. In doing so, they created a dichotomy between the appearance of accuracy and the embodiment of ideologies within his work. Taken to its fullest conclusion, this interpretation negates the possibility that perspectives that are not completely congruous could exist in his production simultaneously.

Art historian Michael Darby produced the first broad overview of Jones’s life and work in his 1976 dissertation, “Owen Jones and the Eastern Ideal.”6 Darby’s work is invaluable to the field because it emphasizes the importance of Jones’s contribution to nineteenth-century design, architecture, and especially color theory in a way that no scholarship had before. In his project, Darby began to contextualize Jones by stressing the importance of his circle of colleagues, but he always emphasized Jones’s influence over the rest of the group and his uniqueness among them. This perspective on Jones firmly planted him within the canon of nineteenth-century architects, but it did not thoroughly investigate of his ideologies. The thirteen pages discussing Jones’s *Alhambra*, in which Darby explains the general outline of Jones’s volumes, and connects them to color theory, are also too brief to unpack all of its imaginative aspects.7

Architectural scholar Carol Flores’s collective works on Jones discuss his *Alhambra* at greater length than Darby’s *Eastern Ideal*, but they paint Jones in a very similar light. In her dissertation, “Owen Jones: Architect” (1996), Flores builds upon Darby’s groundwork to focus more closely on Jones’s architectural theory and other contributions to the field, as

---

6 Michael Darby, “Owen Jones and the Eastern Ideal.” (Dr., The University of Reading, 1974).
well as his impact on later architects and theorists. She discusses Jones’s *Alhambra* in more depth than Darby, but she creates a dichotomy between Jones’s work and contemporary cultural constructs stating that, “An examination of Jones’s text [in the *Alhambra*] affirms his analytical approach to his subject. He replaces the emotive hyperbole and figurative descriptions of his contemporaries with explicit and perceptive analysis.”

In a later article entitled “From Gilded Dream to Learning Laboratory: Owen Jones’s study of the Alhambra,” Flores elaborates Jones’s *Alhambra* more fully, stressing its importance as a teaching tool. This publication elaborates the discussion in her dissertation, but she reaffirms once more the contrast between Jones’s approach and the imaginative constructions of his peers.

Several authors, examining Jones’s *Alhambra* less specifically, provide a more comprehensive context for his work. Sara Searight stands out within this group. Her 2006 article, “Owen Jones: Travel and Vision of the Orient,” elaborates upon the scholars and artists Jones may have encountered in his travels East. By examining the viewpoints of these other men, Searight informs her reader of the complex understanding of the Eastern Other that was prevalent in Jones’s era. Although she emphasizes Jones’s interest in color, Searight’s more specific contextualization of Jones has been useful to this study. Claudia Hopkins nee Heide places Jones’s *Alhambra* firmly within his context in her article, “The Alhambra in Britain: Between Foreignization and Domestication.” In this work, Heide

---

8 Carol Flores, “Owen Jones, Architect” (Ph.D., Georgia Institute of Technology, 1996).
10 Flores, “From Gilded Dream to Learning Laboratory.”
discusses the various representations of the Alhambra that alternately made it more oriental in character, or tried to make it more familiar to British audiences. However, Heide does not find a strong connection between Jones’s *Alhambra* and these artistic tactics, stating that Jones “favored scholarship over Romantic sentiment.” Laura Eggleton’s 2011 dissertation, “Re-envisioning the Alhambra: Readings of architecture and ornament from medieval to modern,” also bears mention here. Although she focuses on Jones’s Alhambra Court at the Crystal Palace (1854) instead of his *Alhambra* publication, Eggleton goes into great detail about nineteenth-century perspectives on the Alhambra, and how Jones contributed to these understandings. She ascribes to Jones an “analytical” approach not common among his peers, but is careful to emphasize that his approach to the Alhambra in his later career re-envisioned the monument in accordance with popular opinion and his personal perspective.

Expanding upon the foundation laid by Eggleton, Heide, and Searight, this study constitutes a more comprehensive look at Jones’s *Alhambra* as an imaginative reconstruction of the Alhambra monument. My argument will revolve around the seemingly contradictory ways that British scholars understood Spain in this era, and how Jones’s interpretation of the Alhambra manifests these understandings. Jones adopted these perspectives for many unique reasons, but the ways in which they are manifested in his book are reminiscent of the works of his peers. Jones’s primarily Islamic representation of the Alhambra criticized the modern Catholic religious and architectural presence at the monument, reiterating the popular view that both the Muslim and Catholic inhabitants of

---

the Alhambra were the Other. Additionally, Jones included romantic depictions alongside his highly detailed reconstructions of architectural and ornamental schemes to appeal to wide audiences while promoting his design reforms. Scholars have not fully understood the connection between Jones and these seemingly contradictory premises because it seems that Jones was primarily interested in Islamic architecture and design reform. However, a closer reading of his text and images shows that these other concerns, so prevalent within the works of Jones’s peers, broadened the scope of his publication as well. In what follows, I will closely examine these inconsistent nineteenth-century views of Spain and their manifestation in Jones’s Alhambra.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} All conclusions I draw are based on my observations of Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra (OCoLC 02803628) held in the University of South Florida Special Collections, unless otherwise specified.
NINETEENTH-CENTURY BRITISH PERSPECTIVES ON SPAIN

The Alhambra that stands in Granada, Spain today is primarily a fourteenth-century Nasrid construction. However, modern scholars believe that a Jewish vizier was the first to build on the Alhambra site during the eleventh-century Berber rule in Spain. The Nasrid Dynasty, once sovereign over much of the southern Iberian Peninsula, was subsequently sequestered to Granada during Ferdinand III’s Spanish invasion in 1248. Three of its rulers, Ismacil I (r. 1314–25), Yusuf I (r. 1333–54), and Muhammad V (r. 1354–59, 1362–91), were the primary constructors of the palace-fortress, which was frequently renovated and built upon for the next two centuries. From its inception, the Alhambra was a fluid monument, undergoing multiple additions and renovations, and often serving as a home to heterogeneous groups.

In the nineteenth century, historians had a different understanding of the monument’s specific history, but were very interested in highlighting its fluid character. Historians were divided in this era about the first group to lay the foundations of the Alhambra site. Some credited the Romans, while others favored the Phoenicians. Most agreed that rebel Muslim Ibnu'l-ahmar took possession of Granada and neighboring Jaen from the Alhomades around 1232, allowing either him or his successor Mohammed II to

---

build the Alhambra as they knew it in their era.\textsuperscript{17} However, the fluid character of Spain and the Alhambra, as perceived by the artists and scholars discussed below, held much more import than the historical details reconstructed by their peers.

It was the instability and mutability of Spain's characteristics and attributes in the nineteenth-century European mind, not its historical background, that allowed for the proliferation of multiple seemingly incompatible views of its monuments. As Claudia Hopkins nee Heide succinctly summarizes, the Alhambra was, among other Spanish monuments, especially susceptible to variable interpretations:

Firmly located in the past, the Alhambra offered no resistance to its powerful translators. Like a plaything, it was dismantled, broken down into pieces, put together again in line with the latest taste, intellectual concerns, demands of the market, and ultimately consumerism.\textsuperscript{18}

This mutable space with a character that is, in part, fabricated by its Western viewers is what Edward Said calls an “Imaginary Geography.” This kind of geography, Said argues, reflects the European \textit{creation} of the Orient based on Eurocentric preconceptions. This fabricated Other has no voice of its own because it only exists as a product of European thoughts about it.\textsuperscript{19} Instead of understanding the Other through a culturally sensitive historical lens, scholars of the East created Imaginary Geographies which they imbued with their own preconceived notions about Eastern cultural character, evolutionary inferiority, and colorful heritage. These imaginative reconstructions of the East were wildly popular in

\textsuperscript{17} Historical Notice by Pascual de Gayangos, preceding \textit{Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra} by Owen Jones. Popular scholarly opinion before de Gayangos held that Ibnul-ahmar, not his successor, began construction of the Alhambra. De Gayangos challenged this perspective in the preface to Jones’s book.

\textsuperscript{18} Claudia Heide, ”The Alhambra in Britain,” 219.

\textsuperscript{19} Edward W Said, \textit{Orientalism}. (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 55-57. Said’s construction of a wholly passive other is narrow in its vision. However, in trying to understand how Jones’s own culture impacted him, it is not expedient here to expound upon the ways that the Other responded to and reshaped the Imaginary Geography created by the British.
Jones’s time and were reiterated so frequently within the Orientalist discourse that they were considered objective fact.

Although Spain is not part of the geographic “Orient,” its similarly mutable character and historic connection to the East made it susceptible to this form of interpretation. The Spanish Imaginary Geography, as created by the British, allowed for the heterogeneous perspectives on the Alhambra that existed in Jones’s time, but scholars deemphasize the ways in which Jones treated the Alhambra, in some ways, as an ideologically loaded Imaginary Geography. His representations of the physical aspects of the Alhambra are generally accurate because of his careful research, but the choices he made regarding what to include within his book and regarding the modes of representation he employed reflect the British Imaginary Geography. Although Jones was successful in formally appreciating the material remains of the Alhambra, his understanding of the structure did not align with localized experiences of the Alhambra in its native culture. Previous scholars, who focus more on Jones’s formal accuracy than his ideological context, have simplified Jones’s complex relationship to this monument.

In the nineteenth-century British context, dual perspectives on Spain were not uncommon. At this time, British citizens were beginning to travel to more remote and exotic locations than ever before. Spain, as a destination that was foreign, but easily accessible, was coming into vogue as a tourist destination.\(^{20}\) Because of its increased popularity, British academics, novelists, and travel writers began to write about Spanish Iberia more often. Both scholarly and popular publications were produced in large

\(^{20}\) Graham Mowl and Michael Barke, "Changing Visitor Perceptions of Malaga (Spain) and its Development as a Winter Health Resort in the Nineteenth Century," *Studies in Travel Writing* 18, no. 3 (07, 2014), 234.
quantity, informing readers about many aspects of the Spanish character, including its cultural customs, beliefs, ideologies, and its people. Within this context, Britons were able to simultaneously adopt seemingly incompatible views of Spain without questioning their veracity. The two most prominent dichotomous perspectives on Spain in Jones’s work are its position as both Islamic and Catholic, and its status as both static and active. In this section, I will expound upon the manifestation of these perspectives in various publications as a way to introduce Jones’s *Alhambra* and its ideological relationship to the work of his peers.

The first set of seemingly contradictory conceptions arose as Britons considered Spain’s alterity. As a part of Southern Europe, Spain was susceptible to Othering by Northern Europeans. In the forum “Europe’s Southern Question: The Other Within” in *Nineteenth-Century Contexts,* Joseph A. Buttigieg explores the issue of Northern prejudice against Southern countries in nineteenth-century Europe. Buttigieg highlights how Montesquieu’s theories of climatology led to a widespread perception that the warmer climates of Southern Europe adversely affected the moral character of Southern Europeans. Less moral, and less capable of technological and cultural advancement, the countries of Southern Europe were considered naturally inferior to their Northern European counterparts.

Nineteenth-century Britons, persuaded in part by theories of climatology, were acutely aware of the dissimilarity between Spain and Britain. However, several key elements of the Spanish character were highlighted as the main manifestation of Spain’s

---

22 Buttigieg, introduction to “Forum—Europe’s Southern Question,” 333.
“Otherness”. For some, Spain was the Catholic Other that destroyed the wonderful civilization of the Moors and corrupted the nation through its reliance on the pharisaical, superstitious priesthood.\(^{23}\) Despite this Catholic dominance in the region, and the final expulsion of the Moors in 1609, Spain also maintained an Islamic character in the minds of many nineteenth-century Europeans.\(^{24}\) Even contemporary Spaniards, who bore no relation to the medieval Muslim inhabitants of Spain, were thought to be more “Oriental” than European.\(^{25}\) This alternate conception of Spain’s religious character led to depictions of Spain that emphasized the exotic, the mysterious, and the Eastern flavor of the nation. In some cases, the Catholic and Islamic natures of Spain were woven together within a single artistic production leading to a complex reinvention of its monuments.

Irish Antiquarian James Cavanah Murphy’s (1760-1814) *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, published posthumously in 1816, was one such production. It was the most important book of illustrations of Spain in its time, and it was still widely regarded when Jones published his *Alhambra*.\(^{26}\) Jones had a copy of this publication in his library, suggesting its importance in the creation of his monumental production.\(^{27}\) Part I of Murphy's book was composed of nine lithographic illustrations of Cordova—primarily focusing on the architecture of the mosque precinct. The more substantial second part described and illustrated “antiquities” (mainly architectural) from Granada. Of these

---

\(^{23}\) “Moor” was a term used in the nineteenth-century to describe the Islamic peoples of al-Andalus, however the term “Moorish” often referred to stylistic qualities from many different geographical regions in the Muslim world. (See McSweeny, 47).


\(^{25}\) Heide, “A Dream of the South,” 65.


ninety-seven plates, seventy-seven depict some portion of the Alhambra, illustrating the monument’s early impact on British architects and travelers. Murphy’s work is characterized by romantic descriptions, emphasizing the sublime, and detailed reproductions showing his immense technical curiosity. Murphy’s endorsement of the publication of *The History of the Mahometan Empire in Spain*, to be read as an introduction to book, illustrates his interest in educating his audience, while many of his plates indicate that he wanted to enchant them.28

The title of his book, *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, reveals the implicit connection Murphy saw between Spain and Islam. Arabian antiquities were such an important part of the Spanish character that they merited their own book. The inclusion of so many plates of the Alhambra within this volume shows the enduring Islamic character of its layout, architecture, and ornament. Murphy also tied the Alhambra to Islam through mythical stories and anecdotes from the lives of Muslim rulers of Granada.29

Despite Murphy’s purported focus on Arabian antiquities, he also highlighted the presence of the Spanish Catholic clergy throughout his book. Many of his plates depict monastic figures in a negative light (discussed in more depth below), and several of his descriptions highlight what Murphy calls the “furious bigotry of the Spaniards.”30 In his description for Plate XI, Murphy criticizes the imposition of the palace of Charles V within

---

28 James Cavanah Murphy and Thomas Hartwell Horne. *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain*. (London: Cadell & Davies, 1815), 7. Subtitled “containing a general history of the Arabs, their institutions, conquests, literature, arts, sciences, and manners, to the expulsion of the Moors,” *The History of the Mahometan Empire in Spain* was written by linguist John Shakespear and Protestant theologian and librarian Thomas Hartwell Horne as an introduction to *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*.

29 See Murphy, *The Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, descriptions for Plates XI, XV, XXIX, XLII in which Murphy discusses Moorish treasure, the Key of God, the last Moorish Sultana, and Moorish disregard for Koranic mandates.

30 Murphy, *Arabian Antiquities of Spain*, 12.
the Alhambra complex, and provides his most scathing review of the Catholic Monarchs of Spain and their unscrupulous treatment of the Moors:

...In any other situation but this, the palace of Charles V. would justly excite admiration: but here it is misplaced, and produces only disgust, especially when it is recollected that its expense was defrayed by part of the money obtained under a false pretence from the unhappy Moors. That oppressed people had presented the Emperor with 80,000 ducats (according to Pedraza, but M. Peyron says 1,600,000 ducats), as a boon for not depriving them of the Arabic language. The artful monarch, received their money, and deluded them with promises that were never fulfilled, and which did not even put a stop to the infamous system of persecuting and ransoming them, under the insidious pretence of effecting their conversion.31

Murphy admits to admiring the palace of Charles V for its formal qualities. However, the king’s malicious practices in Spain in the name of Catholicism tainted Murphy’s perception of the structure within the context of the Alhambra. Murphy’s outrage at the imposition of Catholicism upon Islam within the Alhambra indicates how the coexistence of both religious Others was a central aspect of the Spanish character in his mind.

Another set of seemingly inconsistent viewpoints emerged as Britons considered whether the Alhambra was a static monument from the past that should be viewed through a nostalgic lens, or whether it was an active, living monument that could shape contemporary ideologies. Romantic artists and writers were drawn to Spain because of its popularity among tourists and armchair travelers. However, there was also interest in Spain as a catalyst for intellectual discovery. Through studies of Spain, British travelers and audiences not only grew to understand more about the history of the region, they also attempted to understand and shape nineteenth-century culture. Individuals promoted their ideologies and theories about many different facets of historical and contemporary society through their published perspectives on Spanish. Treating Spain as a platform for their

31 Ibid, 8.
ideas, political theorists promoted progressivism, social activists ventured to understand the implications of slavery, and female authors tried to promote women’s rights. If an idea, policy, or practice was unpopular in Britain, perhaps its merits could be justified through related phenomena in Spain and it would gain acceptance. While this may seem inconsistent with the whimsical, nostalgic character of Spain promoted by the Romantics, many authors and artists visualized the Alhambra as both perpetually nostalgic and imminently relevant to contemporary discourses.

Scottish artist and Royal Academician David Roberts (1796-1864) represented this dual perspective of the Alhambra. He illustrated the important *The Tourist in Spain: Granada*, by Thomas Roscoe, in 1835 to capitalize on contemporary interest in romantic reconstructions of Spain and the Alhambra. This volume became one of the most popular iterations of Jennings’ *Landscape Annual* series, which allowed the British middle-class to cheaply collect fine art as they fantasized about travel to other locales. The entire series of Spanish Annuals (1835-1838; Granada, Andalusia, Biscay and the Castiles, Spain and Morocco) was very lucrative for Jennings, and it was one of the formative productions in Roberts’s artistic career. Thomas Roscoe introduces his work as both factual and romantic, based on his personal nostalgia and the whimsical narratives throughout his text. Roberts’s illustrations and the accompanying descriptions complement Roscoe’s

---

32 Juan L. Sanchez, "Spain, Politics, and the British Romantic Imagination." (Ph.D., University of Notre Dame, 2007), 68; David Howarth, *The Invention of Spain: Cultural Relations between Britain and Spain, 1770-1870*, (Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press; Distributed exclusively in the USA by Palgrave, 2007), 23; John-David Lopez, "The British Romantic Reconstruction of Spain" (Ph.D., University of California, Los Angeles), 11-12.

33 Heide, “Alhambra in Britain,” 206.


35 Saglia, "Imag(in)ing Iberia,” 128.
purposes—alternating between the historical and the romantically anecdotal. Roberts’s description of the vignette on the title page illustrates his romantic sentiments:

The aspect of the entire region is now wild and desolate, but still, in spots, retains marks of its former cultivation. Although almost totally neglected, the soil is so rich, that the tourist has the greatest difficulty in keeping his horse from sinking over the knees in the thick alluvial soil.  

This style of description nicely complements his illustrations, discussed below, which interpret the Alhambra almost exclusively through a romantic lens.

While Roberts conformed to the romantic purposes of the publication as a whole, he also used his illustrations to promote his theories about the connection between Gothic and Islamic architecture. Roberts, among others in the nineteenth century, believed that Islamic architecture gave rise to the Gothic style in Europe. He was able to garner favor for this idea, which was previously unpopular, through his representations of the Alhambra. For Roberts, the nostalgic, historic character of the monument did not invalidate its impact on contemporary theory. Rather, in productions like Roberts’s, there is a subtle and intricate balance between the romanticization of the Alhambra and the application of its principles to nineteenth-century debates.

The subtle balance of what modern scholars might consider conflicting ideologies, found in the works of both Murphy and Roberts, are found to an equal degree in Owen Jones’s Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra. This book, published serially from 1836 to 1842, stands apart from the works of Murphy and Roberts because of its
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37 Tonia Raquejo, ”The 'Arab Cathedrals': Moorish Architecture as seen by British Travellers." The Burlington Magazine 128, no. 1001 (August, 1986), 560.
38 This is the view still held today by many scholars.
39 Raquejo, ”The ‘Arab Cathedrals’”, 555-563.
breadth and its attempt at visual and historical accuracy. However, Jones’s perspective on the Alhambra is similarly complex and equally evident through his visual and literary programs. Like Murphy, Jones responds to Spain as an unfavorably Catholic, but perpetually Islamic locale. Like Roberts, his work appeals to his viewers as romantic and nostalgic while its details promote his architectural theories.

Jones’s use of color, often studied by scholars, is one of the main indicators of Jones’s distinctly nineteenth-century perspective on the Alhambra. Chromolithography, Jones found, was much more complicated than standard lithographic practice, but it was the only process that could faithfully reproduce the bold colors of his Alhambra. After initially hiring Day and Haghe to create his colorful plates, Jones bought his own lithographic press which he set up at 11 John Street, Adelphi. At this point, Jones became deeply involved in the printing process himself, hiring a group of printers “after [his] own heart,” who would help him produce a superior product. Jones took such pains to perfect the lithography in his Alhambra because promoting polychromy in ornamentation was an important part of his comprehensive program. While he educated and excited his audience with his depictions and descriptions of the Alhambra, he wanted approval of the polychromatic systems of ornamentation he produced for Great Britain.

The unclear organization of Jones’s book also indicates his goals and perspectives beyond scholarship. In the first volume, Jones’s plates are organized neither by image kind or relative geography. For research and explanation purposes, I have categorized Jones’s

40 When he was unable to obtain sponsorship from the French government, Jones funded much of the Alhambra project himself, receiving remuneration from his 163 subscribers. Kathryn Ferry, “Owen Jones and Chromolithography,” Architectural History, 46 (2003), 176-177.
41 Darby, “Owen Jones and the Eastern Ideal,” 45. Jones employed the Vizetelly Brothers and Co. to print his woodblocks and text, and Gaywood & Longwarth to print his engravings.
images into six different groups: plans, views, sections, details, elevations, areas, and pieces. Plans, elevations, and sections are similarly schematic in nature (see figures 2 and 3), while areas and views give the viewer a better sense of how regions of the Alhambra function in relation to one another (see figures 4 and 5). Details and pieces are both decontextualized portions of the Alhambra—ranging from ornamentation and column capitals to doors (see figures 6 and 7). Pieces are separated from details, however, in that details always necessarily depict ornamentation from the same part of the Alhambra, while pieces depict either similar ornaments from different locations, or specific elements like doors and windows. Although all of the plans fall at the beginning of Jones’s Alhambra, and most of the pieces fall at the end, there is no immediately comprehensible organizational strategy based on image type in the main body of the book.

Jones’s first few plates depict the Puerta de Principal ó de Justica, the Casa Real, the Patio de la Alberca, and the Sala de los Embaxadores, from southernmost to northernmost region, leading the reader to believe that Jones organized his book geographically instead. However, this initial progression gives way to seemingly random jumps from place to place within the Alhambra complex. Two series of plates XIII-XXI and XXVII-XXXI hover around the Court of the Lions, but the plates before and after these sections do not have a unifying geography. This un-systematic approach is further complicated by the serial nature of this production. Plates were not released in numerical order, and there is no indication that their release was determined by geography or plate type.43 This contrasts sharply with other similar catalogues from the nineteenth century, like Description de l’Egypt (1809-1822). The 894 plates of Description de l’Egypt are divided into three sections: Antiquities,

the Modern State, and Natural History. The Antiquities section of the work, which corresponds most closely to Jones’s *Alhambra*, is further divided using an inherent logic. Different Egyptian structures are pictured first through an aerial map, then through a landscape view, then through elevations and sections, which are subsequently broken down to their ornamental and architectural details. One as obsessed with accuracy as modern scholars portray Jones might have methodically reconstructed his chosen monument with a discernable organizational scheme similar to the one found in *Description de l’Egypt*. Perhaps Jones’s inattention to organization shows, instead, his varied imaginative aims and objectives, which did not require him to present a completely legible recreation of the monument’s organization.

While Jones’s disorganization shows that he had concerns beyond accurate reporting, other aspects of Jones’s *Alhambra* manifest specific ideologies more prominently. Jones’s understanding of the Alhambra as a part of the East is unequivocal in his categorization and fragmentary treatment of different aspects of the Alhambra, and in his attention to the translation of Arabic inscriptions. Jones’s *Alhambra* is filled with decontextualized plates depicting very specific areas of the monument. His depictions are further classified as either, as the title states, plans, elevations, sections, or details. Classification and fragmentation were popular tools used by nineteenth-century scholars of Oriental languages to help their readers better understand the East. In *Orientalism*, Edward Said states that Orientalism had “a proclivity to divide, subdivide, and re-divide its subject matter.”

This was a calculated decision on the part of Orientalist scholars like French linguist Antoine de Sacy, who developed a theory of fragments that would allow him to
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present isolated excerpts of Arabic texts to his European readers. The isolation of excerpts, along with allowing de Sacy to highlight his commentary on the texts he translated, was designed to make his material more manageable for his readers. Similarly, Jones’s isolation of elements of the Alhambra may have helped his readers more clearly comprehend the unfamiliar Islamic architecture. In dividing the complex ornamental schemes into smaller sections, Jones allowed his viewers to build their knowledge of Islamic architecture without becoming overwhelmed. Arabic translation was another major task of the Orientalists to which Jones paid special attention. By including Spanish Arabist Pasqual de Gayangos in the project, Jones affirmed his interest in the Alhambra as a monument closely tied to the East and its languages.

In a further effort to give his readers the most comprehensive picture of the Eastern character of the fourteenth-century Alhambra, and to promote his design theories, Jones extensively reconstructed what was, in his time, already a dilapidated monument. Throughout his Alhambra, his reconstructive efforts range from filling in architectural gaps, to recreating color schemes, to eliminating Catholic interventions in the palatial complex. Jones’s descriptive plates also explain and evaluate restoration efforts and later interventions in the Alhambra. Often critical of Catholic destruction, or attempted restoration, of the “Moorish” ornamentation, Jones takes every opportunity to explain details of the Alhambra that do not coincide with the decorative scheme he is reconstructing. Although Jones is transparent about where reconstructions occur, he argues that portions of the Alhambra that do not correspond to his design theories are the
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46 See Figure 8. Upon Jones’s visit to the Alhambra, the façade of the Court of the Mosque was disfigured by later interventions, but it was restored in its entirety in Plate XXIII.
result of a misunderstanding of the space, or of later interventions. In accordance with this argument, Jones frequently explains his reconstructed colors within descriptive plates.

Although Jones’s *Alhambra* depicts primarily architectural and ornamental details, his inclusion of figures in some illustrations sheds light on his perceptions of Spain and the Alhambra. All three of Jones’s “Views” contain figures (figures 4, 9, and 10), as do ten out of eleven vignettes from the descriptive pages (see figure 11). “Views” contextualize the ornaments and spaces discussed elsewhere in Jones's *Alhambra* by showing their connection to one another and through the use of these figures. While Jones's viewer can see the way *muqarnas* vaulting and arabesque patterning interact *in situ*, she can also get a sense of how people relate to their architectural surroundings. Used to convey a sense of scale, the types of figures Jones includes help construct the past and present cultural context of the monument. Jones’s woodcut vignettes only occur on seven descriptive pages in the lengthy first volume, and they are almost never referred to in the text (see figure 12). However, these vignettes appear more whimsical and romantic than his lithographed plates, emphasizing the grandeur and decay of the Alhambra.

In contrast to his romantic vignettes, Jones’s descriptive texts are information-rich. Many of his descriptive pages contain English and French translations of Arabic inscriptions, explanations of the techniques used to fabricate different sections of the Alhambra, and even specific measurements of the different areas of the palace. Additionally, in these pages, Jones tries to situate the architectural scheme of the Alhambra within the broader context of Islamic architecture. Despite expressing elsewhere that the ornament of the Alhambra surpasses any other ornament in the Muslim world, Jones may include these comparisons to help his readers comprehend the unfamiliar ornamentation
of the Alhambra.\textsuperscript{47} On a few occasions (Descriptive Plates XVII, XX, XXI, and LI) Jones uses romantic language to describe the Alhambra, but he more often engages with Orientalist scholars than with the Romantics in his descriptive text.\textsuperscript{48}

As noted by art and cultural historian Gülru Necipoğlu in \textit{The Topkapı Scroll: Geometry and Ornament in Islamic Architecture}, the second volume of Jones’s \textit{Alhambra} is of an entirely different character than the first.\textsuperscript{49} The volume, containing fifty plates with eighty-seven images, does not contain the descriptive, contextual material characteristic of Jones’s first volume. Only nine of the plates, all of which appear near the front of the volume, are standard lithographs. The remaining forty-one plates are chromolithographs depicting details from various regions of the Alhambra. Twelve of these plates correspond to nine plates from Jones’s first volume.\textsuperscript{50} These highlight or expand particular details from Volume 1 to give the reader more visual information. However, the thirty-eight other bold, decontextualized plates appear like pages in a pattern book. Pattern books, popular in the nineteenth century, were created to provide decorative motifs for interior designers and architects to incorporate into their designs.\textsuperscript{51} Much like Jones’s second volume, these books contained consecutive pages illustrating different ornamental elements with little to no descriptive text. The drastic difference between the thorough contextualization of Jones’s
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\textsuperscript{47} See Owen Jones, \textit{The Grammar of Ornament}. (London: Day and Son, 1856), Moresque Ornament.

\textsuperscript{48} His engagement with scholars is evidenced by his frequent citation of Orientalist translator Edward William Lane’s \textit{Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians} of 1836 (see for example Plate XXVI), and of Spanish linguist Pablo Lozano y Casela’s \textit{Antiguedades Arabes de España} of 1780 (see Plate XXII), among others.


\textsuperscript{50} Jones \textit{Alhambra}, Volume 2, Plates XII, XIV, XV, XVIII, XIX, XXIV, XXVII, XXXI, XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.

\textsuperscript{51} Jones’s \textit{Examples of Chinese ornament selected from objects in the South Kensington museum and other collections} of 1867 is an example of a pattern book.
first volume, and the decontextualization of highly legible details in his second volume supports Necipoğlu’s claim that Jones purposefully formatted his second volume as pattern book. Although many have noted Jones’s overarching educational goals, viewing his second volume as a pattern book adds an interesting complexity to Jones’s production.

Although scholars have studied Jones’s *Alhambra* in the past, this section has provided a foundation for exploring his work in a different way. I have shown that the deep cultural constructs that inform the works of his contemporaries can also be seen in the general format of Jones’s book. I will further elaborate its complexities below as I compare Jones’s imaginative reconstructions of the Alhambra more closely with specific depictions by his contemporaries.

---

EXPLORING THE DUAL OTHERNESS OF JONES'S ALHAMBRA

As historian David Howarth states in *The Invention of Spain*, “Catholicism was the most characteristic thing about Spain in the minds of the British.”\(^{53}\) This being the case, it seems only natural that I begin to delve deeper into my reevaluation of Jones's *Alhambra* with this consideration in mind. Catholicism in the broadest sense was unpopular among the British public and policy makers despite the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act in April of 1829.\(^{54}\) British Protestant theologians in this period considered the Catholic faith universally heretical. 'Popery' was condemned wherever it existed because it was thought to separate worshippers from an unmediated relationship with God. However, theologians pitied residents of other countries for being subject to Catholic religious systems, while they viewed Spanish Catholics as almost universally fanatical. This fanaticism was typified by the cruelty of Spanish Inquisitors during the crusades, and was considered an enduring quality of Spanish clergy and laypeople through the nineteenth century.\(^{55}\) Britons also viewed the political ramifications of Catholicism in Spain in a negative light. The Catholic government of Spain, by expelling the last of the ethnic 'Moors' in 1609, was thought to have retarded the progress of Spanish economics, subsequently requiring British intervention in the peninsula.\(^{56}\) These negative views of Spanish

\(^{53}\) Howarth, *The Invention of Spain*, 64.

\(^{54}\) Ibid, 61.


Catholicism were perpetuated amongst the British public through anti-Spanish propaganda pamphlets that denigrated nearly every aspect of Spanish life.\textsuperscript{57}

James Cavanah Murphy's interpretation of the Alhambra emphasizes the superstitious, unscrupulous nature of Spanish Catholicism and its clergy. The tenth plate of \textit{The Arabian Antiquities of Spain}, depicting the façade of the Alhambra from a distance, exemplifies Murphy's negative perspective (figure 13). Murphy's image has two distinct focal points. The first is the looming \textit{Torre de Comares}, and the second is the prominently foregrounded scene of a Spanish Catholic clergyman, a cross, and an artist. In Murphy's scene, Catholicism has become, very literally, the front matter. We see the Catholic priest performing a Christian blessing on a cross, erected near the Islamic structure, as his personal artist sits by recording the event.\textsuperscript{58}

As historian Michael Stevens notes in \textit{Spanish Orientalism}, the artist in this scene can alert the viewer to the negative connotation of the priest's presence at the Alhambra.\textsuperscript{59} This artist, commissioned to record the priest's reclamation of and blessing over the region, makes the Catholic endeavor seem unspiritual and ostentatious. By bringing an artist to what could be sacred event, this priest seems more interested in receiving acknowledgement for his contribution to the Christianization of Spain, than in actually helping the country or its inhabitants. For Murphy's British viewers, this could reaffirm the notion that priests have a heightened sense of self-importance, creating barriers between Catholic worshipers and God, and corrupting the Christian faith. From a formal perspective,

\textsuperscript{58} Although this is an imaginative creation by Murphy, contemporary thought held that overly pious invaders added crosses to the interior of the Alhambra to “Christianize” the spaces after it was conquered.
\textsuperscript{59} Stevens, “Spanish Orientalism,” 92.
the artist acts as a barrier between the priest and the cross—a symbol of Christ—highlighting the disconnect between priests and true religion. Additionally, the distance between this scene and the Alhambra creates a sense that these men do not truly belong in this location, despite their personal sense of importance. For Murphy, this scene is not one of private spirituality, but of a religious façade masking arrogance, pretentiousness, and a conquering spirit.  

Jones shows the Catholic character of the Alhambra in a much more subtle way. Instead of foregrounding the negative aspects of Catholicism in Spain to highlight Spanish alterity, Jones praises the Nasrid creators of the Alhambra, thus implicitly criticizing the current Catholic rulers of Spain. Jones’s vignette heading the description of Plate I provides a parallel to Murphy’s twentieth plate (figure 14). Jones’s scene does not have a defined focal point and his figures’ diminutive size and non-descript Spanish dress make them relatively unimportant in comparison with Murphy’s priest. In a scene where Murphy made a conscious decision to blatantly Catholicize the Alhambra, Jones made a different decision. In fact, Jones almost universally excluded Catholic clergy members from his depictions of the Alhambra.

In his thirteen plates and vignettes that show figures, clergy appear, subtly, twice. It also seems that Jones only depicts priestly or monastic types on the outskirts of the central Alhambra complex. In the vignette of descriptive Plate XXIII, the clergyman is depicted conversing with a turbaned man in the court of the mosque (now Catholic chapel). It seems that Jones’s viewer only sees this Catholic figure here because he is about to enter into a Catholic space, which is unexplored in Jones’s volumes. A man in what could be priestly or
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60 His collaboration with Thomas Hartwell Horne, who also authored *Popery, the enemy and falsifier of Scripture* in 1844, provides further evidence of Murphy’s mistrust of Catholicism.
monastic attire is also seen at the outside edge of the Court of the Fishpond in Plate IV (figure 4). Neither man is foregrounded within the Alhambra complex and neither is actively engaged in Catholic liturgy.

Similarly, Jones removes almost all traces of Catholic architectural alterations within the fortress. In *Re-envisioning the Alhambra*, Laura Eggleton highlights Jones’s selective editing of Catholic ornamentation within the Alhambra. She closely examines the Alhambra’s mosque-turned-chapel that Jones omits from his reconstruction. By omitting this space entirely, Jones avoided the tiled murals added by Charles V bearing crown emblems and the slogan ‘Plus Oultre’, which is prominently visible in modern photographs (figure 15).\(^6\) Despite the fact that the mosque was likely the most characteristically Muslim feature of the Alhambra complex, its more recent Catholic interventions, which Jones viewed as architecturally, and thus ideologically, inferior to the original Muslim design, caused its exclusion from Jones’s visual program.\(^6\)

Instead of including Catholic interventions within the Alhambra, Jones focuses on the architectural prowess of its medieval creators. His Plate X, “Details of the Great Arches. Hall of the Bark,” (figure 16) is not only masterfully rendered, but its description outlines the complex geometric schemes that the original architects employed to create this intricate edifice (figure 17). Jones praises these Nasrid constructors of the space for their applied knowledge of mathematics in creating *muqarnas* vaulting. However, far from being

\(^6\) He omits this region from his visual reconstruction despite the fact that he mentions the Catholic alteration of the space on Descriptive Plate XLIII.
\(^6\) For Jones, architectural detail in religious contexts flowed from the ideologies of the religion that created them. For this reason, Jones generally believed that religious groups that were truer to their religious faith created superior architecture and ornament. For more of Jones’s views on this subject, see Owen Jones, “On the Influence of Religion upon Art,” in *Lectures on Architecture and the Decorative Arts by Owen Jones*, (London: Chadwyck-Healey, 1835), 3-25.
a sign that Jones favored medieval Muslims, this more positive view of the fourteenth-century builders of the Alhambra could have been a device to criticize modern Spanish Catholicism within the complex.

Nineteenth-century Britons often presented medieval al-Andalus, the fourteenth-century Granadine region ruled by the Nasrids, as a hybrid utopia that engendered a society of religious tolerance and intellectual progress, unlike the religious and social strictures that inhibited Spanish progress in the modern era.63 Scottish novelist Walter Scott illustrates this popular view of the Moors in his novel *Ivanhoe* (1820). In it, Jewish characters, Rebecca and Isaac, take refuge in the kingdom of Granada where they will be accepted and protected, as they would not be in England.64 It seems that Jones could be reiterating this understanding of medieval Spain because he felt that the Catholic rule of Spain was less legitimate than the former Nasrid rule. The religious strictures of the Catholic Church and its monarchy destroyed the civilization that produced Jones’s favored ornamental schemes and began to let the Alhambra fall to ruin—compelling Jones to present it in a full reconstruction. Catholic rulers and parishioners did not belong in Jones’s reconstruction of Spain because of their disregard for the ornament and customs that preceded them in the region. In delegitimizing the Catholic presence in the Alhambra in this way, Jones recognizes that Catholicism is a fundamental, albeit negative, part of the monument’s character. Although Jones could have had primarily stylistic, rather than religious motives for this method of reconstruction, his artistic predecessors and the

63 Howarth, *The Invention of Spain*, 10; Eggleton, "Re-Envisioning the Alhambra," 218; Heide, "A Dream of the South," 65. The state of peaceful coexistence between Christians, Muslims, and Jews within Iberian kingdoms from the eighth to fourteenth centuries is commonly referred to as “La Convivencia.”

64 Stevens, *Spanish Orientalism*, 46.
overarching religious and political climate in which he worked lend credence to this interpretation.

As Jones praises the Alhambra’s Muslim creators, showing his implicit bias against Spanish Catholics, he also perpetuates the idea that Spain is Other because of its Islamic history and enduring Islamic character. The Islamic history of Spain naturally resulted in a continued, wide-reaching, interest in Spain as East. This is exemplified through the career of noted Spanish Arabist Pascual de Gayangos. Included as a historian and translator for Jones’s project, de Gayangos dedicated his career to understanding Hispano-Islamic history through the study of the Arabic language. Whenever de Gayangos discussed Spain, it was in the context of the Moors and focused on understanding the historic Muslim character of the region.65 On a popular level, Spain was also transmitted to the wider British public as a part of the increasingly popular Orientalist fad. As British audiences became more interested in the East, travelers, artists, publishers, and playwrights catered to this interest by using the Orient (including Spain) as their subjects with greater frequency.66

Despite the popularity of Spain as a part of the Orient, the Alhambra was not inevitably Islamic in nineteenth-century British depictions. While both Jones and Murphy emphasized the Islamic nature of the Alhambra, noted Orientalist painter John Frederick Lewis (1804-1876) emphasized the peculiarity of Spain’s Spanish inhabitants within this space. By the time of his death, Lewis was one of the most prominent members of the British art establishment, and one of the most well known painters of the East.67 His

66 Saglia, Poetic Castles, 261.
67 Lewis was bestowed the honor of election as a Royal Academician in 1865. Briony Llewellyn, “"Solitary Eagle"?: The Public and Private Personas of John Frederick Lewis (1804-1876)” in The
mature oeuvre is characterized by meticulous, ethnographic representations of the East, especially Egypt and the Ottoman Empire.⁶⁸ These iconic representations, which were created much later than his Spanish works, emphasize the cultural alterity of his Eastern subjects. He highlights the lavish sensuality of the Orient and gives his viewers an inside look at the seductive harem culture that was so mysterious to Western viewers. However, early in his career, Lewis traveled to Spain and produced a body of work that divorced the country from its Islamic heritage. His Spanish works focused on the passion and sensuality of contemporary Spaniards instead of the mystery of Medieval Muslims, and are more akin to genre scenes than the ethnographic catalogs he would later produce.⁶⁹ Given his later interest in depicting the Islamic Other, Lewis’s interpretation of Spain highlights the conscious choice involved in Jones’s construction of an Islamic Alhambra.

In his drawing, Courtyard of the Alhambra of 1832-33 (figure 18), Lewis emphasizes the Spanish character of the Alhambra in two ways.⁷⁰ First, he obscures most of the Islamic ornamentation of the Alhambra. Although exterior surfaces of the Alhambra are often un-ornamented, the ornamentation around the doorway in Lewis’s scene is very non-descript and almost entirely in shadow. This is especially striking given the relative lack of shadow in the rest of the image. The horseshoe arch, the thin columns, and the ruined jalousies give
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⁷⁰ It is unclear which courtyard this drawing is supposed to reference. Some of the architectural elements are reminiscent of the Court of the Mosque, but Lewis’s configuration of the space seems unlike any of the “courts” contained within the Alhambra.
the viewer an indication that this is a Muslim structure, but Lewis does not present the
Islamic ornament of the Alhambra with the detail of Jones or Murphy. His representation of
vegetal ornament is loosely sketched in, the geometric jalousies are relatively indistinct
because of shadow, and there is a complete absence of epigraphic ornamentation. Despite
its finer finished look, this drawing was likely not intended to be a finished product, which
may account for the lack of detail. However, the prominent shadows would have obscured
the ornament even in a more polished work.

Second, Lewis includes only Spanish figures within this courtyard. The two men on
the left are iconic Spanish muleteers. Washington Irving described these men as the main
carriers of commerce in Spain, as men who lived frugally and roughly to survive. Irving also
popularized Muleteers in the English-speaking world as naturally poetic and talented, and
their caravans were considered one of the picturesque sights in the Andalusian
landscape.\textsuperscript{71} The woman in the doorway, and the younger woman on the steps are both
veiled—a popular trend across socio-economic classes in this era. The bearded man in the
hat and cape seems to stand between the muleteers and the doorway on the right. He too is
in Spanish dress, wearing the tight pants, boots, and cape reminiscent of a Spanish \textit{majo}.\textsuperscript{72}
\textit{Majos} were characterized by their garish costume, and fiery passion associated with their
lower class. Lewis situates these individuals easily within the Alhambra as the Spanish
Other. Despite its history, ornamentation, and architecture, the Alhambra is not inevitably
Islamic. For Lewis, it is Spanish at its core.

By contrast, there is always a Muslim presence within Jones’s \textit{Views}. His
woodblocks often depict those in contemporary Spanish dress alone, but his major

\textsuperscript{72} See figure 19 depicting Richard Ford in a Majo costume.
lithographic compositions are not without prominently Islamic features. In fact, most of his views contain Muslim figures exclusively. Plate IV, “View of the Court of the Fish-Pond from the Hall of the Bark”, in which figures in contemporary Spanish dress dominate the pictorial space, is the exception to this rule (figure 4). However, a bearded, turbaned man is foregrounded and placed closest to the ornamental designs, the main subject of Jones’s plate. This man is seated on the floor, a posture commonly given to Muslims in nineteenth-century European depictions, and is smoking with a man in contemporary Spanish dress.

Plate XIX is a more typical representation of people within an architectural space. It utilizes three Muslim types that would become prominent in the later Eastern work of John Frederick Lewis—the seated type, and the turbaned smoker with his African servant (figure 10). In the “View in the Hall of Two Sisters,” Jones recreates almost all of the Alhambra’s characteristic features for his viewers. In the foreground, one sees many of the stuccoed arabesques and geometric mosaic details that Jones reproduces more closely in his first and second volumes. This view also includes niches and scalloped archways in the fore, and muqarnas vaulting above the arches in the background. The comprehensive detail in the foreground can be examined to the minutest level and retain its precision, and the ornamental details in the background are still very recognizable despite the atmospheric perspective. This is an important view for Jones to reproduce because it gives his viewers an idea of how the architectural elements work together within the real space of the Alhambra. This view is also significant because it reinforces the Muslim character of the monument through the inclusion of Muslim types. In the foreground, Jones includes a bearded, turbaned man with his young African servant who carries his pipe. The preponderance of pictorial representations of Muslims with African servants seems to
suggest that it was an especially popular and intriguing relationship to nineteenth-century Europeans. The smoking of a pipe or hookah was also seen as a characteristic part of life in the East. In the background, another man in Eastern dress sits, contemplative, with serving vessels in front of him. Despite his accouterments, this individual seems almost lackadaisical. This seated, turbaned type would also become popular in Lewis’s later work depicting Egypt and the Ottoman Empire. More akin to Lewis’s Egyptian works than his Spanish Alhambra, Jones adopts a mode of figural representation that associate the monument very closely with Islam and the East. By including figure types commonly used by Orientalizing artists, Jones entered, in some ways, the Orientalist discourse. While his ornamental recreations were often accurate, his figures imaginatively reconstructed the people that he believed best accompanied this monument.

Despite the above evidence, scholars have trouble understanding Jones’s Alhambra as both Islamic and Catholic because this hybridity manifests itself as primarily Islamic. In Murphy’s Arabian Antiquities, the Islamo-Catholic character of the Alhambra is highlighted through the overt inclusion of Catholic clergy members within the Islamic spaces of the monument. Although the Alhambra bears explanation and illustration because of its “Arabian” character, Murphy highlights how the Catholic Other that has intruded within the space, fundamentally altering its character. By contrast, Jones responds to the Catholic presence within the Islamic Alhambra by erasing Catholic interventions from his reconstruction. This omission of a Catholic presence within the Alhambra creates a significant absence. Far from being inconsequential, the Catholic involvement in the Alhambra was so prominent, and so distasteful, that it warranted willful omission.

73 See figure 20.
In excluding the Catholic aspects of the Alhambra, Jones successfully acknowledges and critiques the Islamo-Catholic character of Spain and its monuments, without having to stray from his medieval focus. Because of his interest in the Islamic heritage and ornamentation of the site, Jones criticizes the way the Alhambra has been Catholicized in his era, inadvertently highlighting, thus, the subsequent Catholic conquest of the monument. If the contemporary Alhambra was not in some ways “Catholic” in Jones’s mind, he would not show the Palace of Charles V in his general plan of the Alhambra or mention other Catholic interventions in the space. By mentioning these interventions briefly, but marginalizing them in his broader literary and pictorial program, Jones strengthens his critique of an Islamo-Catholic Alhambra.

It seems very likely that this critique is indeed of Catholic interventions, and not of specific stylistic changes because of the way Jones addresses architectural changes within his text. He never uses stylistic terms when critiquing later changes to the Alhambra, which he refers to harshly, but vaguely. Although he also does not mention that Catholic rulers were those who undertook “repeated restorations” that defaced the palatial ornament, his audience may have inferred that these were the alterations he was referring to.74 This is especially probable given the more overt criticism undertaken by Murphy several years earlier. The seemingly contradictory religious characters of the Alhambra may be less visibly manifested in Jones’s *Alhambra* than in Murphy’s *Arabian Antiquities*, but Jones’s book still understands the nineteenth-century Alhambra as Islamo-Catholic. The visual absence of Catholic clergy or Catholic architecture in Jones’s *Alhambra* is as meaningful as
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74 Owen Jones, *Alhambra*, Descriptive Plate XIII.
their inclusion by Murphy, and shows a similar critique of the Islamo-Catholic character that was forced upon the monument through Catholic invasion.

Scholars are also reluctant to accept Jones’s work as a commentary on the Islamo-Catholic character of the Alhambra because of the appearance of accuracy within his architectural reconstructions. Since Jones endeavored to produce a faithful reconstruction of the fourteenth-century Islamic Alhambra, his work is viewed as if it were scientific rather than subjective. Somehow the integrity of his ornamental details is viewed as inconsistent with Jones’s critical commentary on the layered religious character of the Alhambra in the nineteenth century. However, it is clear that the seemingly inconsistent religious characters of the Alhambra were both very important to nineteenth-century British interpreters of the space. Jones could offer to his readers an accurate reconstruction of Alhambric ornamentation as he provided his commentary on the contemporary religious character of the monument without causing confusion.75 However, our modern sensibilities—which divorce accurate depictions from value-laden interpretations, and reject dichotomy—have altered our understanding of the scope and purposes of Jones’s Alhambra. Although Jones undoubtedly attempted to accurately reconstruct the Medieval Muslim monument, his Alhambra also gives us insight into the dual Other within the Alhambra in the nineteenth century.

---

75 Jones’s willingness to sacrifice a depiction of the contemporary character of the Alhambra in an effort to reconstruct his conception of its Medieval state is reminiscent of the relationship between Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc and the Gothic architecture of France. However, it should be noted that Jones’s restorative efforts were confined to his imaginative reconstructions, as he did not attempt to engage in remedial architecture. For more on Viollet-le-Duc see Martin Bressani, *Architecture and the Historical Imagination: Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, 1814–1879*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2014).
EXPLORING THE FLUID HISTORIC CHARACTER OF JONES’S ALHAMBRA

For many British travelers, Spain represented a pre-industrialized past that was unmarred by the concerns of rapid urbanization. These travelers popularized a romantic conception of Spain and the Alhambra that permeated British representations of this location. Inundated with romantic travel accounts, novels, and works of art, British commoners widely viewed Spaniards as primitive savages who lived in a landscape of pre-modern ruins. These views of Spain led to a nostalgic conception of the purity of this “less-advanced” society, and to depictions that ignored progress and modernization. Many fixed their romantic gaze on Moorish Spain and the Alhambra because its preservation reminded the European traveler of a radically different past that was in danger of fading away. As opposed to the Islamic monuments in the geographic “East” that were still used and inhabited by non-Europeans, the Alhambra represented a static, historic monument through which the Romantic artists could recapture the past. Romantic depictions of Spanish scenes, like the works of David Roberts, make heavy use of atmospheric perspective, Oriental and Spanish types, and signs of decay to emphasize the sublime qualities of the country, its architecture, and its people. Although Jones’s

80 The Sublime embodies notions of grandeur, beauty, and horror. If something is considered sublime, it is both wonderful and disconcerting. The idea of sublimity is also closely associated with a picturesque conception of the East. Claudia Heide, "The Alhambra in Britain," 207.
lithographed architectural reconstructions are devoid of these elements, many of the woodcuts illustrating his descriptive pages embrace them whole-heartedly.

The footnote accompanying Jones’s woodblock on descriptive Plate LI makes his intention to present romantic views on his descriptive pages clear:

The ‘Casa de Sanchez’ no longer possesses the picturesque appearance shewn in the wood-cut. In 1837, the whole front was restored and beautified, and the pond converted into a garden by one of the resident military officers of the fortress.81

Here, Jones states that he is forsaking his pristine reconstruction in favor of a picturesque depiction of the Casa de Sanchez that does not reflect its current state. Being neither a completely past or present reality, this woodcut and its description are indicative of Jones’s acceptance of romantic and picturesque reconstructions of the Alhambra.

Jones and David Roberts likely met during their simultaneous trips to Spain and the Alhambra, where they observed and recorded the monument over the same period of time. Their subsequent romantic reconstructions of the Alhambra, published within a year of one another, are strikingly similar. Roberts’s frontispiece for The Tourist in Spain: Granada depicts a scene whose focal point is the Alhambra’s Tower of Comares (figure 21). The tower looms over the figures in the foreground and the Spanish landscape, filling the top two-thirds of the picture plane. In looming as such, the tower evokes the foreboding nature of the sublime. The diminutive size of the figures further emphasizes how the viewer should be in awe of such a monumental construction. Signs of decay on the structure are obvious: the foremost architectural elements are stripped of their outer stucco exposing gutters that protrude from the side of this secondary tower. Further back in the scene, exterior architecture is also crumbling and structural elements are exposed. The entire

81 See figure 13.
façade seems to rise out of, or perhaps crumble into, the rock outcropping on which it is built. These signs of decay emphasize the nostalgia evoked by the Alhambra, which was once the center of a thriving civilization, but has fallen into disuse and disrepair.

Roberts also utilizes light to accentuate his romantic reconstruction. The light of the setting sun filters through gaps in the architecture, flooding some sections with light and obscuring others in shadow.82 The rays of light are clearly seen emanating from the left side of the central tower, to emphasize the ephemerality of this place, and metaphorically represent the Alhambra’s decline from its original glory. Finally, Roberts obscures the path to the Alhambra to add to the mystical nature of the romantic ruin. Although the figures at the bottom of the illustration are on a path, the viewer cannot discern how that path reaches the Alhambra. The path reappears behind the trees in the middle ground, and in other locations, but there is no definite point at which the path reaches the fortress. The Alhambra, illustrated throughout The Tourist in Spain: Granada, ultimately remains inaccessible to the figures in this print.

Jones’s woodcut prints on the descriptive pages of the Alhambra are similarly romantic in their presentation of the monument. Jones’s view of the Tower of Comares on the back of his first descriptive page is no exception (figure 22). Although devoid of the human presence found in many of Jones’s other woodcuts, this scene also employs the romanticizing techniques found in Roberts’s frontispiece. Jones’s Tower appears at a greater distance than Roberts’s, but it is viewed from a similar angle. By foregrounding foliage, Jones’s Tower seems taller without physically taking up the majority of the picture plane. This foliage also obscures the viewer’s access to the tower. Although there is empty

82 Given the fact that façade of the Torre de Comares faces northeast, and the rays of light are coming from behind and to the left of the central tower, one can deduce that this is a sunset scene.
space on the left side of the image, the main tower of this façade seems too overgrown to be reached. It rises starkly from untamed nature as a monument closely associated with it. The association between a built structure and the wild, untamed natural setting makes the structure seem even more unruly and imposing. Signs of decay are also present in Jones’s woodcut, although not as prominently as they are in Roberts’s. The foremost signs of decay are on the Tower itself, with its stucco crumbling off. Because of the tower’s distance from the viewer, much of this decay may be obscured.

Jones’s puzzling use of light in this print illustrates the complexity of his romantic reconstruction. Although the high contrast between light and shadow corresponds to a traditional Romantic treatment of light, the way the façade of the tower is illuminated is not naturally possible. The viewer can see the sun setting clearly between the Tower of Comares and the smaller tower on the right. However, the outer façade of the Alhambra is bathed in light. The impossibility of this lighting serves two purposes. The focal point of this image remains highlighted; the looming Tower of Comares with its crumbling architecture can be seen clearly. Simultaneously, the setting sun makes light seem to radiate from within the Alhambra. Although Jones constructs the Alhambra as a dilapidated location, this light could allude to the riches within this structure. Light comes from within the Alhambra to tell Jones’s viewers that the former glory of the Alhambra is still available to them through Jones’s reconstruction. Curiously, Jones labels this woodcut print “Tower of Comares,” but labels no others. The reasons for this decision cannot be known with certainty, but it calls to mind the way in which Roberts’s frontispiece is labeled in The

---

83 However, we know that Jones did not try to hide the ruinous aspects of the Alhambra in his vignettes based on his other woodblock print from the same page. See figure 23.
Tourist in Spain: Granada. Perhaps Jones decided to label his woodcut here as a reference to this Romantic model.

Jones’s work is similar, although not identical, to Roberts’s on another front: both men promote their design and architecture theories through the Alhambra. In this sense, Jones and Roberts treated the Alhambra as an Imaginary Geography at its most fundamental level. Both took the historic Alhambra and made it imminently relevant in the contemporary debates in which they were engaged. In Jones’s case, the debate focused on polychromy in contemporary ornament. In his extensive travels to the East, Jones became fascinated with the ways in which polychromatic ornamentation enhanced the overall effect of architecture. Although primary colors were used often in the ornamental schemes Jones studied, they were seldom found in British design leading up to the nineteenth century.84 Jones created his Alhambra to counteract this trend by popularizing bold polychromatic ornamentation within the British national style. Roberts, on the other hand, was engaged in a discourse that sought to valorize Gothic architecture through its connection to Islamic art. Roberts believed that Gothic architecture had its roots in the Islamic architecture of the past, so he altered his perspective of the Alhambra to highlight the Gothicizing inclinations of its pre-Gothic architecture.85 By focusing on specific aspects of the Alhambra, both men transformed the monument to support their respective positions. These men were not alone in promoting theories of design through the Alhambra, but a juxtaposition of their depictions will further clarify Jones’s interpretive choices.

84 Darby, “Owen Jones and the Eastern Ideal,” 29, 64.
85 Raquejo, “The 'Arab Cathedrals',' 560.
Jones’s Plate XXVII, containing details of the Hall of Justice, is a bold chromolithograph, utilizing gold, black, and red for visual impact (figure 24)\(^86\), while Roberts’s Illustration of the Hall of Justice, from *The Tourist in Spain* (1835) is a standard grey scale lithograph that imbues the Hall with intrigue in completely different ways (figure 25). Roberts’s illustration is a scene, in real space with interacting human figures, while Jones’s is an architectural drawing focusing on a specific colorful section of the Hall of Justice.\(^87\) Jones’s notation of scale in the middle of the page emphasizes his commitment to numeric precision. By contrast, Roberts is willing to take architectural liberties in his reconstruction. He elongates the archways, making them slightly more pointed than the arches of the actual structure, and saturates them with detail, to ensure that they loom over the figures in the scene. This effectively makes his Hall of Justice appear more Gothic than Jones’s. The lighting in Roberts’s work also serves this purpose: the lower area of the lithograph, filled with people, is light and airy—making the darker architectural portion seem even more drastic and brooding.

Although Jones's detail may be more architecturally correct, he, too, selectively presented aspects of the Alhambra to construct a narrative for the space. Whereas Roberts elongated arches and added a foreboding atmosphere to the Hall of Justice, Jones added a color scheme that was not extant. Instead of presenting the Alhambra as he saw it, Jones

---

\(^86\) Other versions of this plate (particularly the one held at the University of Minnesota) contain bright blue pigment where there is light grey in the University of South Florida copy. There are two possible explanations for this discrepancy. First, the pigment in the USF copy may have oxidized, rendering the blues more muted. Second, copies with brighter pigment may be from print runs conducted after Jones’s death. For more on the color, and the process of coloring, in Jones’s work see Ferry “Owen Jones and Chromolithography.”

\(^87\) Interestingly, despite the depth of Jones’s work, he only recreated details, pieces, and sections of the Hall of Justice. While Views from the Lion’s Court and Hall of Two Sisters are important tools for his viewers to conceptualize these spaces, perspectival scenes of the Hall of Justice are notably absent.
reconstructed the colors of the Alhambra that confirmed his theories about the beauty of bold color in architectural design. There is little doubt about the accuracy of his color reconstruction here, since it was based on pigment scrapings from the site. However, there is some skepticism about the complete accuracy of all of his reconstructions. For example, Jones claimed that the marble columns of the Alhambra were gilded. He argued that gilded columns would make the space visually more pleasing, so they must have been gilded, despite literary evidence to the contrary.  

Whether or not Jones's polychromatic reconstructions were always correct, the fact that he chose color (at great expense to himself) over standard lithographs is of imminent importance. Jones reconstructed a decontextualized, colorful section of the ornamentation of the Hall of Justice to provide a pre-modern foundation for brightly colored ornament in British design. Instead of utilizing a standard lithograph, he used chromolithography to emphasize the bold, primary color scheme that he thought created repose. To achieve his design goals, this ornamental detail did not need to be contextualized, or presented within an architectural space—it needed only to be colorful. Jones's emphasis on color, as a part of his broader design theory, illustrates that the nostalgic, static Alhambra had continued relevance for himself and his peers.

The Alhambra’s appeal as both static and active might initially be more puzzling than its simultaneous Catholic and Islamic character. If a monument is historic and nostalgic, can it also be relevant to contemporary concerns? A romantic locale is

88 For information on this discrepancy see Darby, “Owen Jones and the Eastern Ideal,” 56-57.
90 “Repose” is a word later used by Jones in The Grammar of Ornament to describe the result of ornament that was perfectly balanced, needing neither additions nor subtractions to satisfy the viewer. In the Grammar, Jones indicates how closely the Moors followed the natural rules of ornamentation, which created repose.
foreboding, ruinous, and picturesque by definition. It is viewed with longing and appreciated for its awful character, not for its relevance to contemporary intellectual debates. Viewers interested in the romanticism of medieval monuments may not be equally concerned with contemporary theory. Yet, Jones and Roberts applied design principles from the romantic Alhambra to distinctly nineteenth-century architectural debates in publications meant for diverse audiences.

This can be seen as an especially strategic move on Jones’s part. Jones’s book needed to offer something to the non-architect. While plans, elevations, sections, and details were interesting to a small subset of the population, his descriptions with inlaid romantic woodblocks intrigued a wider public. As a reviewer from the Literary Gazette wrote in 1842, “...for while every thing that could captivate the taste of the dilettante has been sought for and engraved, details of high importance to the architect, ground-plans and sections of buildings, worthy of frequent imitation, have been carefully attended to.” This viewer believed that Jones’s engravings captivated someone with a more casual interest in the monument in a way that his lithographed architectural elements could not. Including some depictions of the ruined state of the Alhambra may have also bolstered his claims about its polychromatic ornamentation. By showing that the Alhambra was not entirely the monument it used to be, Jones made his audience wonder about the appearance of a pristine Alhambr. Jones’s reconstruction of the fully polychromatic interior then satisfied his viewers’ curiosity. Jones emphasized these seemingly incongruous understandings of the Alhambra to his best advantage. The previous grandeur shown in his

chromolithographs made the Alhambra’s sublime qualities even more distinct, and Jones’s romantic depictions made his reconstructions more enticing.

Disinterest among scholars in the interplay between nostalgia and contemporary discourse in Jones’s *Alhambra* is even more baffling than the previous lack of research about the interaction between Catholicism and Islam in Jones’s depictions. While Jones deliberately hides the Catholic nature of the Alhambra in his reconstruction, the romanticism of his woodcuts is overt. Yet, scholars focus on how his *Alhambra* promotes contemporary theories and neglect how it coincides with romantic sentiments. I think this stems, once again, from a reluctance to believe that an author could convey multiple contradictory premises simultaneously. Since Jones’s interest in the Alhambra’s impact on contemporary color theory is very clearly manifested in his volumes, scholars do not inquire further into the ways in which Jones may have portrayed the Alhambra as a static monument. By focusing on the numbered plates of Jones’s volumes instead of his descriptive pages, scholars have further reinforced the notion that Jones’s *Alhambra* was an active monument unlike the nostalgic Alhambras of his peers. However, in recognizing the complexity of the work of his peers, and the frequent connection between nostalgic depictions and contemporary issues, the multiple perspectives of Jones’s *Alhambra* become much more evident and his volumes become even more meaningful.
CONCLUSION

Nineteenth-century interpreters of the Alhambra, with their full adoption of seemingly inconsistent views of the space, inadvertently mirrored the fascinatingly contradictory history of the monument. Although the Alhambra evinces power in its construction and design, it was built by rulers whose power was in jeopardy. While there was relative peace and security through treaties and vassalship to the Christian kings of Spain during the construction of the Alhambra, the death of its last major patron, Muhammad V, in 1391, ushered in a period of infighting and increased external pressure, weakening and subsequently terminating Nasrid rule in the region. Outside of its context, the fortress and palace of the Alhambra might be viewed as evidence of a thriving, secure nation-state. However, in the context of Nasrid rule in Spain it signals a final effort by Muslim rulers in Spain to assert their dominance over a dwindling dominion, and to forestall the inevitable completion of the Reconquista. Although nineteenth-century scholars, writers, and artists were likely unaware of the disconnect between Nasrid presentation of grandeur and their actual authority in the region, their interpretations of the site’s past and present led to fruitful reconstructions of this complexity.

In mirroring the complex history of the monument, nineteenth-century artists and scholars also emphasized specific dualities that had greater historical pertinence than they may have realized. The twofold religious character of the Alhambra, which was a prominent part of nineteenth-century conceptions of the monument, had its origins in the

---

monument’s creation. Before the Catholic interventions and additions to the space, Catholicism was an integral factor in shaping the construction of the Alhambra and the subsequent Andalusian civilization under Nasrid rulers. Not only did the ever-present threat of Catholic invasion prompt a costly show of strength and fortitude, but the realized Catholic conquest of Spain also drove large Muslim populations to the last seat of Muslim rule in the Iberian peninsula. This increased population facilitated the growth of al-Andalus, which was maintained peacefully through acceptance of several minority groups. Although nineteenth-century scholars emphasized the progressive values of the “Moors” that fostered goodwill between people who were otherwise pariahs, Catholic dominance in the region likely played its part in the creation of a motley society within the walls of the Alhambra. A nostalgic view of the Alhambra, popular in Jones’s era, was likely also held in an early period in its history. While the major construction of the monument was completed during the last period of Muhammad V’s rule from 1362 to 1391, Muslim rulers continued the build on the site through the 1450s. However, in 1492 Granada fell to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, marking the completion of the Reconquista. With the quick transition from active Muslim cultivation of the site to complete Catholic control over it, it is likely that Muslims looked to the Alhambra as the last surviving remnant of their bygone civilization soon after its construction was completed.

With his Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Owen Jones contributed to the complex and elaborate history of the Alhambra monument. Joining his peers in re-presenting the Imaginary Geography of the Alhambra to his contemporaries, Jones emphasized some of the most fascinating contradictions within the character of the

---

monument that scholars are still exploring today. Jones’s *Alhambra* was peculiar among the work of his contemporaries because he explored the monument’s seemingly inconsistent facets through a purportedly accurate reconstruction of the fourteenth-century architecture. However, Jones’s *Alhambra* was Catholic and Islamic, static and active, precise and whimsical, and it remains an important tool for understanding British views of Spain in the nineteenth century.

Future scholars could explore how Jones’s *Plans, Elevations, Sections and Details of the Alhambra* embodied British conceptions of Spain in many productive ways. Although I have provided a broad overview of the types of plates in Jones’s work, one could go into much greater depth about how each type of plate functions within the whole. By isolating groups of plates, one might uncover an even greater complexity in the way Jones approached the Alhambra in relation to contemporary theories and perceptions. Within these plate groups, Plates XLVI through L that depict figural paintings on the ceiling of the Hall of Justice seem especially ripe for contextual interpretation. A deeper reading of Jones’s text should also be undertaken to assess the ways in which Jones interacted with his peers on a literary level. Scholars should also consider other prominent features of the Spanish Imaginary Geography that Jones may have incorporated into his *Alhambra*. Other nineteenth-century writers, scholars, and artists explored economic policy, human rights, and suffrage in Spain in an effort to shape British ideologies, and Jones could have been among them. Finally, this study has shown that Jones’s *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra* is an integral part of a wider discussion about the fluid nature of the Alhambra. In the future, Jones’s *Alhambra* should be situated within the wider scope of historic literature on the monument that includes both Western and non-Western sources.
Figure 1: Owen Jones. Plate XXXIV from *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra*, Vol. 2. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 2: Owen Jones. Plate III, “Plan of the Royal Arabian Palace in the Ancient Fortress of the Alhambra” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Colored Lithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 3: Owen Jones. Plate V, “Transverse Section of the Court of the Fishpond, Looking Towards the Palace of Charles the Fifth” from *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra*, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Lithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 4: Owen Jones. Plate IV, “View of the Court of the Fish-Pond from the Hall of the Bark” from *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra*, Vol. 1, c. 1836-1842. Lithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 5: Owen Jones. Plate IX, “Divan, Court of the Fish-Pond” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 6: Owen Jones. Plate XXIX, “Detail of an Arch. Portico, Court of the Lions.” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 7: Owen Jones. Plate XXXV, “Capital of a Column from the Hall of the Ambassadors, and Four Small Engaged Shafts from the Hall of the Two Sisters” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 8: Owen Jones. Plate XXIII, “Court of the Mosque” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 9: Owen Jones. Plate XIX, “View in the Hall of the Two Sisters” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Lithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 10: Owen Jones. Plate XIII, “Entrance to the Court of the Lions (Restored)” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Lithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 14: Owen Jones. Vignette from Descriptive Plate I from *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra*, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Woodblock Print on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 15: Tiled ‘Plus Ultra’ mural dating from the reign of Charles V. Photo courtesy of Laura Eve Eggleton.
Figure 17: Owen Jones. Descriptive Plate X (front and back) from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Woodblock Prints on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
Figure 18: John Frederick Lewis, *Courtyard of Alhambra*, 1832-1833. Watercolor drawing on paper. The Fitzwilliam Museum.
Figure 19: Jose Becquer. *Richard Ford as a Majo*, 1832. Watercolor on Paper.
Figure 20: John Frederick Lewis. *And the Prayer of the Faith shall save the Sick*, 1872. Oil on Canvas. Yale Center for British Art.
Figure 24: Owen Jones. Plate XXVII, “Details of an Arch in the Hall of Justice” from Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra, Vol. 1. c. 1836-1842. Chromolithograph on Paper. Special & Digital Collections, Tampa Library, University of South Florida.
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APPENDIX I

Variant Copies Consulted

In my research I was fortunate to be able to examine three variant copies of *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra*. While all versions contained the same basic structure and plates, there seemed to be great variance in printing techniques and subsequent handling. The University of South Florida copy, the primary source of information for this thesis, is notable for its muted gray-blue in all chromolithographed plates, and for the destroyed final descriptive page and missing final plate in the first volume. By contrast, the University of Minnesota copy is in pristine condition, but seems to be a compilation of plates in various sizes from the presses of both Jones and the Vizetelly Brothers. The lithographs are generally darker and more detailed than in the South Florida copy, but the blues have inconsistent saturation. The University of Minnesota copy is also notable because it was unbound and each page permanently rebound within a vellum sheath. The third copy, containing only the first volume, was digitized by the Smithsonian Institute Libraries, and viewed electronically through archives.org. Although I could not examine the physical copy, its lithographs and chromolithographs seem generally darker than the South Florida copy, but blue pigment is almost entirely absent from most of the chromolithographs. The chromolithographs depicting mosaic tile work are the exception to the rule. This digital copy was primarily useful with reference to the descriptive pages, which I could access without having to travel to a Special Collections. The following catalog entries are derived from information from the holding institutions and my own observations.
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Goury, Jules and Owen Jones. *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra / from Drawings Taken on the Spot in 1834 by Jules Goury, and in 1834 and 1837 by Owen Jones. with a Complete Translation of the Arabic Inscriptions, and an Historical Notice of the Kings of Granada from the Conquest of that City by the Arabs to the Expulsion of the Moors, by Pasqual De Gayangos.* London: O. Jones, 1842-45. ([London]: Vizetelly Brothers and Co.)

2 v.: 20 p., 51 leaves of plates (some color); 50 leaves of plates (some color); 60 cm.

Notes: Chiefly in English and French.
Volume 1 has added t.p.: La Alhambra palais ...
Volume 2 has added t.p.: Details and ornaments from the Alhambra.
"Vizetelly Brothers and Co. Printers 135 Fleet Street"--t.p. verso.
South Florida Copy: Vol. 1 lacks plate 51, contains description. (OCoLC) 02803628.

University of Minnesota

Goury, Jules and Owen Jones. *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra / from Drawings Taken on the Spot in 1834 by Jules Goury, and in 1834 and 1837 by Owen Jones. with a Complete Translation of the Arabic Inscriptions, and an Historical Notice of the Kings of Granada from the Conquest of that City by the Arabs to the Expulsion of the Moors, by Pasqual De Gayangos.* London: O. Jones, 1842-45. ([London]: Vizetelly Brothers and Co.)

2 volumes : illustrations (part color) ; 60 cm.

Notes: Chiefly in English and French.
Volume 1 has added t.p.: La Alhambra palais ... 1841.
"Vizetelly Brothers and Co. Printers 135 Fleet Street"--t.p. verso.
University of Minnesota Copy: Both vol. rebound. Contains smaller plates affixed to larger folios. (OCoLC)2803628.
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Goury, Jules and Owen Jones. *Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Details of the Alhambra / from Drawings Taken on the Spot in 1834 by Jules Goury, and in 1834 and 1837 by Owen Jones. with a Complete Translation of the Arabic Inscriptions, and an Historical Notice of the Kings of Granada from the Conquest of that City by the Arabs to the Expulsion of the Moors, by Pasqual De Gayangos.* London: O. Jones, 1842-45. ([London]: Vizetelly Brothers and Co.)

1 Volume : 344p.; illustrations (part color)

Notes: Chiefly in English and French
Vol. 1 has added t. p.: La Alhambra palais ... 1842
Vol. 2 has added t. p.: Details and ornaments from the Alhambra. 1845.
Smithsonian Copy: Plate 49 Missing from Original. Digitized by Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum Library's Rare Books, Smithsonian Institution Libraries, was supported in part by funds from the Metropolitan New York Library Council (METRO) through the New York State Regional Bibliographic Databases Program. (OCoLC)ocm02803628.