

Contextualizing the Emergence of Food Packaging: Processes – Materials – Periods

Athanasios Stathopoulos^{1}, Marios Tsigonias¹, Aristotle Tympas²*

¹ Department of Graphic Design and Visual Communication, University of West Attica, Egaleo, Greece

² Department of History and Philosophy of Science, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

*Corresponding Author: Athanasios Stathopoulos- Email: [astathopoulos@uniwa.gr]

Short Abstract

Food packaging history has often been presented through fragmented narratives that separately emphasize container design, material substitution, or regulatory developments. Such approaches rarely treat packaging as an integrated technical system shaping the organization of food production and circulation. This study reconceptualizes food packaging as food provisioning infrastructure, arguing that its historical evolution is best explained through processes of system integration, standardization, and industrial scaling rather than through intrinsic material superiority. It asks: How did packaging develop from discrete transport containers into synchronized industrial systems? Under what conditions did materials prevail? Do major transitions in packaging reflect systemic reconfigurations rather than simple material replacement? Methodologically, the research undertakes a historically grounded systems analysis based on comparative examination of key foundational scholarship (Twede (2002, 2005, 2012, 2016), Pearson (2016), Robertson (2019), Spiekermann (2011), and Hawkins (2012)), and selected primary marketing sources, including advertisements, trade press material, company catalogues, and packaging labels. Technical transformations—forming, sealing, dimensional precision, mechanization, and logistical alignment—are organized within the analytical framework Processes–Materials–Periods. The findings identify three structural transitions across contexts: regime compatibility in pre-industrial transport systems; industrial integration characterized by sequential machine linking, conveyor-based continuous flow, machinable sanitary design, and escalating throughput, reinforced by institutional standardization; and third, nested system expansion into retail infrastructures, regulatory harmonization, industrial consolidation, and global distribution networks. Structural shifts in packaging correspond to the integration of sequential operations into continuous production systems that enabled repeatability and large-scale output. Material changes mostly reflected infrastructural and institutional compatibility. As integration intensified, environmental externalities became structurally embedded. The study concludes that packaging operates as a synchronizing infrastructure coordinating food provisioning and shaping environmental performance through the configuration of production, distribution, and recovery systems rather than through material substitution alone. By foregrounding system dynamics over isolated artefacts, this research contributes a unified historical framework for packaging, printing, and process-engineering scholarship.

Keywords: *food packaging history, system integration, industrial scaling, packaging engineering, printing-packaging interface*

1. Introduction and Background

The historical development of food packaging has frequently been narrated through fragmented analytical trajectories. Some accounts trace successive container forms, emphasizing transitions from clay and wood to metal, paperboard, and plastics. Others foreground regulatory developments, hygiene standards, or the scientific rationalization of food quality and safety. While these approaches provide valuable descriptive depth, they rarely conceptualize packaging as an integrated technical system shaping the organization of food production and circulation.

This separation becomes particularly evident when packaging histories are compared with studies of food standardization. Scholarship on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century food systems has demonstrated how scientific expertise, chemically defined standards, and regulatory harmonization rendered food measurable, comparable, and trustworthy within mass markets. Yet the technical infrastructures through which such standards were materially enacted, most notably packaging systems, have often remained analytically peripheral. Conversely, packaging histories frequently document container design, mechanical improvements, and transport compatibility without theorizing packaging as a central production infrastructure.

This study addresses that historiographical gap by reconceptualizing food packaging as food provisioning infrastructure. Rather than treating packaging as a passive container or isolated material artifact, it is understood as a synchronizing system coordinating forming, sealing, dimensional precision, mechanization, and logistical alignment. Its historical “evolution” is interpreted not as a linear sequence of material improvements but as a series of systemic reconfigurations characterized by integration, institutional stabilization, and industrial scaling.

The analysis is structured around three interrelated research questions:

1. How did packaging develop from discrete transport containers into synchronized industrial production systems?
2. Under what infrastructural and institutional conditions did specific materials prevail?
3. Do major transitions in packaging history reflect systemic reconfigurations of production, logistics, and regulation rather than simple material substitution?

To answer these questions, documented technical transformations are organized within the analytical framework **Processes – Materials – Periods**, allowing packaging history to be reconstructed as the progressive integration of sequential operations into coordinated systems capable of calculability, repeatability, comparability, and scale.

2. Materials and Methods

This research is designed as a historically grounded systems analysis based on the comparative examination of foundational scholarship in packaging history and food standardization. The analytical corpus includes Twede (2002, 2005, 2012, 2016), Pearson (2016), Robertson (2019), Spiekermann (2011), and Hawkins (2012). These works were selected due to their empirical richness, detailed documentation of technical processes, and historical coverage spanning pre-industrial, industrial, and post-war contexts.

To extend the analysis from technical integration to market formation, the study will also incorporate selected primary marketing sources, including newspaper advertisements, trade press material, company catalogues, packaging labels, and, where accessible, company archival material from food and packaging producers. These sources will not be used as secondary illustrations of technological change, but as first-hand evidence of how packaging technologies were presented, legitimized, and made meaningful within emerging mass food markets. Particular attention will be paid to claims concerning hygiene, freshness, convenience, standardization, brand identity, responsibility, and trust, in order to examine how standardized food became not only technically reproducible and scalable, but also visible, branded, trusted, and desirable.

The study does not seek historiographical exhaustiveness. Instead, it concentrates on this bounded corpus to reconstruct recurring structural patterns of transformation. Each source was subjected to close comparative reading, and documented technical developments were extracted and classified according to three analytical dimensions:

- **Processes:** forming, filling, sealing, synchronization, conveyor linking, mechanization, and throughput scaling.
- **Materials:** machinability, sealing integrity, dimensional precision, and infrastructural compatibility.
- **Periods:** identifiable structural reconfigurations characterized by production integration, labor restructuring, logistical alignment, and institutional stabilization.

Historical causality was inferred only where explicit technical reconfigurations were documented in the literature, such as the transition from hand-soldered cans to sanitary seam systems, or the displacement of barrel geometry under rail-based freight standardization. Interpretive claims were not assumed beyond documented transformations.

Through comparative mapping of these transformations across contexts, three recurring structural transitions were identified:

1. **Regime compatibility** within pre-industrial transport systems.
2. **Industrial integration** characterized by continuous flow and mechanized synchronization.
3. **Nested system expansion** into retail infrastructures, regulatory harmonization, industrial consolidation, and global distribution networks.

No experimental data were generated. No quantitative modeling was performed. No images were altered or manipulated. All interpretations remain grounded in published scholarship and comply with academic standards regarding citation integrity and intellectual property.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Structural Transition 1: Regime Compatibility

In pre-industrial contexts, packaging functioned primarily as an instrument of circulation rather than as an integrated production system. Amphorae operated as standardized trade units embedded in Mediterranean maritime networks. Their pointed bases enabled efficient interlocking storage in ship holds, and their volumetric consistency facilitated comparability in exchange. Standardization emerged from logistical compatibility rather than from mechanized synchronization.

Similarly, wooden barrels prevailed because their cylindrical geometry aligned with maritime and wagon-based handling regimes. Guild-regulated production stabilized dimensional consistency, and standardized capacities structured taxation and trade. However, forming, filling, and sealing remained episodic and unsynchronized. Packaging at this stage reflected infrastructural alignment within transport systems rather than continuous industrial integration.

The first structural transition thus corresponds to packaging operating as regime-compatible transport architecture. Material prevalence during this period was determined by alignment with transport geometry, resource distribution, and commercial institutions rather than by intrinsic material superiority.

3.2 Structural Transition 2: Industrial Integration

A decisive transformation occurred when forming, filling, and sealing operations were mechanically integrated into continuous production systems. Prior to integration, can manufacturing consisted of discrete and unlinked operations lacking coherent production flow. The introduction of conveyor-based linking reorganized production into synchronized assembly-like systems.

The sanitary can eliminated solder-based production constraints and enabled hermetic integrity compatible with high-speed machinery. Throughput expanded dramatically, shifting from craft-scale batches to industrial-scale output. Labor relations were restructured as artisanal skill dependence declined. Dimensional tolerances, seam precision, and closure compatibility became structural requirements for maintaining uninterrupted flow.

Institutional standardization reinforced this transformation. Scientific and regulatory frameworks stabilized measurable food quality and comparability. Packaging became the material interface through which standardized products were operationalized.

Under these conditions, packaging ceased to function merely as containment. It became inseparable from industrial manufacturing architecture. It structured production temporality, stabilized repeatability, and enabled scalable provisioning across national markets.

The second structural transition therefore corresponds to the integration of sequential packaging operations into synchronized industrial systems.

3.3 Structural Transition 3: Nested System Expansion

As industrial integration intensified, packaging systems expanded beyond factory lines into broader logistical and retail infrastructures. Mechanized folding cartons aligned with automated filling operations and emerging self-service retail environments. Corrugated fiberboard gained dominance when its rectilinear geometry aligned with rail transport, standardized freight practices, and mechanized handling systems.

Packaging became nested across primary, secondary, and tertiary levels, coordinating production, warehousing, distribution, and retail display. Industrial consolidation and regulatory harmonization reinforced dimensional standardization across markets. Standardized container formats synchronized global distribution networks.

At the same time, environmental externalities became structurally embedded within scaled production systems. The proliferation of single-use packaging generated waste streams and political concern. Recycling infrastructures and environmental regulation emerged in response, yet largely operated within existing industrial architectures rather than replacing them.

Environmental performance thus became a function of system configuration, throughput intensity, logistical alignment and recovery coordination, rather than intrinsic material virtue.

This third structural transition therefore corresponds to nested infrastructural expansion, in which packaging operates simultaneously across production, distribution, retail, and environmental governance systems.

3.4 Answering the Research Questions

The analysis demonstrates that packaging “evolved” from discrete transport containers into synchronized industrial systems through the progressive integration of sequential operations into continuous flow architectures. The transition from regime compatibility to industrial integration reorganized forming, filling, and sealing into coordinated systems enabling repeatability and throughput escalation.

Materials prevailed not because of intrinsic superiority but because they were compatible with dominant production machinery, transport infrastructures, and institutional standards. Clay amphorae aligned with maritime stowage systems; wooden barrels with river and wagon-based logistics; tinplate cans with mechanized sealing and retorting; corrugated formats with rail freight geometry; plastics with high-throughput filling lines and global supply chains.

Major transitions in packaging history therefore reflect systemic reconfigurations of production, logistics, and regulation rather than simple material substitution. In other words, material change seems to follow structural compatibility.

3.5 Limitations

This study remains primarily grounded in technical and historical scholarship and incorporates selected primary marketing sources to connect technical integration with market formation. It does not include quantitative modeling or non-Western case studies. While cross-source triangulation mitigates interpretive bias, the analysis remains constrained by the scope and geographical focus of the selected literature and accessible archival material.

4. Conclusions

This study reconceptualizes food packaging as synchronizing infrastructure within food provisioning systems. Its historical “evolution” can be understood through three structural transitions:

1. Regime compatibility in pre-industrial transport systems.
2. Industrial integration through continuous flow and mechanized synchronization.
3. Nested system expansion into retail, regulatory, and global distribution architectures.

Material changes largely reflected infrastructural and institutional compatibility rather than intrinsic improvement. Structural shifts correspond to the integration of sequential operations into continuous production systems enabling repeatability and scale. As integration intensified, environmental externalities became structurally embedded, and sustainability emerged as a system-level property rather than a material attribute.

By foregrounding system dynamics over isolated artifacts, this study offers a unified historical framework for packaging, printing, and process-engineering scholarship. Packaging emerges not as peripheral containment but as a central infrastructural technology coordinating production, circulation, standardization, and environmental performance.

Acknowledgements

The author declares that no external funding was received for this research. This research was conducted as part of the author’s doctoral research in the History of Technology.

References

- Hawkins G. 2012. The Performativity of Food Packaging: Market Devices, Waste Crisis and Recycling. *The Sociological Review* 60(2_suppl), 66-83.
- Pearson G. 2016. The Democratization of Food: Tin Cans and the Growth of the American Food Processing Industry, 1810-1940, Dissertation Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee of Lehigh University in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
- Robertson G. 2019. History of Food Packaging, In: *Reference Module to Food Science*, Elsevier Publishing.
- Spiekermann, U. 2011 Redefining food: the standardization of products and production in Europe and the United States, 1880–1914. *History and Technology*, 27(1), 11-36, DOI: 10.1080/07341512.2011.548971
- Twede D. 2002. The Packaging Technology and Science of Ancient Transport Amphoras. *Packaging Technology and Science* 15, 181-195.
- Twede D. 2005. The Cask Age: The Technology and History of Wooden Barrels. *Packaging Technology and Science*, 18, 253-264.

Twede D. 2012. The Birth of Modern Packaging. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 4(2), pp 245-272 .

Twede, D. 2016. *History of packaging*. In: Jones, D.G.B., Tadajewski, M. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Marketing History*. Routledge