

Good essay on comparing raleigh amphitheatre to roman amphitheatre

[Design](#), [Architecture](#)



Introduction

The roman amphitheaters were places that hosted a range of delightful activities for the people of the Roman Empire. The amphitheaters are still in existence and have a rich historical symbolism of the appreciation of art that the Roman Empire had. Throughout history, theaters have been a symbol of delight and a place where people could express ideas about their cultures, politics and societal issues. The same is the case with the amphitheaters in North Carolina that are a symbol of the delight that emanates from music, dance, poetry and drama. The visual pieces that will be discussed have a number of similarities and differences, but share the fundamental goal of giving delight to their audiences.

The Raleigh amphitheater in question is an outdoor piece of art that is surrounded by a green environment that gives it a serene and peaceful look. The trees that surround it are strategically and evenly dispersed around the place and manage to give it a greenness that was probably the idea behind the architecture of the site. The amphitheater is small but is greatly suited for a small audience. The idea behind the design was probably to find an audience that had the same goal and interests in mind. The smallness it possesses makes it ideal for an audience that is intimate and shares common interests. The place appears to be suitable for weddings, plays that speak to a particular group of people, and other events that are meant for specific persons. It is different to the Roman amphitheater in question because of the audience that the two would attract based on the size. The roman amphitheater is big, and even though it is open at the top, the sides remain enclosed by a wall on the sides. The size that it has seems suitable

for an audience of any type and lacks the intimacy that is portrayed in the one at Raleigh. In addition, it is not surrounded with as much green environment as represented by the former. The idea behind the Roman amphitheater was to attract an audience that was interested in public aspects of entertainment and was not designed for a particular type of audience.

Both amphitheaters are made of ancient stones in their architecture and have small seats that are made from the same material. The stones are used to make everything in both arts, from the seats to the podium in the one at Raleigh. The Roman amphitheater had the stone walls and seats. However, the latter has an ancient feel to its architecture of which the former is devoid. The Raleigh amphitheater has embraced a hint of modernism in its design, based on the manner in which the stones and the seats are curved. The Roman one has a historical feel to its design, which is suggested by the way the stones are placed and the architecture of the walls. The amphitheater depicts the appreciation of history. In addition, it appears to hold events that are filled with historical and cultural significance, which are mostly public, unlike the case with the one in Raleigh.

There are symbols of Palladian architecture in the work done in the Raleigh amphitheater, which hints to its embracing of tradition and some history, albeit with a hint of modernism. The architecture of Palladio was also appreciative of nature, and his work was chosen with a strategic regard for the ambiance that an environment could offer. His buildings also had a mixture of modernity and tradition that was highlighted by the choice of painting he put, structural design and the use of stones for his buildings. The

same is the case with the amphitheater in this discussion, whose structure has the simplicity, and modernist kind feel about it. Even so, it still manages to highlight aspects of tradition from the manner in which the seats are carved in stone.

Architecture and tradition are related in the sense that most designs are inspired by it in their creation. Art is shaped by culture in the aspect of authenticity and inspiration to make art that tells a story. In both amphitheatres, there is a hint of tradition that helps to give the architecture originality. Great architects such as Walter Gropius have used tradition in their buildings in an effort to incorporate a sense of history in the designs. The same is the case with the two architectures under discussion, even though the Roman one is more invested in traditional design.

Conclusion

Even though the two architectures have some differences, they can be identified to cause delight in their audiences. That would be deduced from the elucidation clearly given exceeding. As mentioned, Roman amphitheatres were dwellings that hosted wonderful undertakings for the people of the Roman Empire. That explains why amphitheatres were, and still are in existence along with their profound historical symbolism of the appreciation of art that the Roman Empire. The structures serve the same purpose and are, therefore, more similar in ways that surpass the difference in their architectures.