In 2011, William S. Peterson and Sylvia Holton Peterson published *The Kelmscott Chaucer: A Census*. Five years later, another census by the same authors has appeared: *The Daniel Press & The Garland of Rachel*. Both books, published by Oak Knoll Press, have a private press book as their subject, but while these are, in a way, similar, the differences couldn’t be greater. The *Chaucer* is a massive folio containing more than 550 pages, printed in 1896 in an edition of 440 copies; the other a small octavo of around 60 pages with a modest circulation: a mere 36 copies were distributed in and after 1881. One was published by the most prominent modern private press, The Kelmscott Press, whose iconic Arts and Crafts founder William Morris expressed influential ideas about typography; the other was issued by a small and less familiar nineteenth-century private press started by the reverent Henry Daniel (1836-1919). Daniel printed his first books as a schoolboy in Frome, and after he moved to Oxford, he continued printing with the help of family members. Whereas the Kelmscott Press elicited numerous books and articles, the Daniel Press has been somewhat ignored. In 1921, Falconer Madan published a bibliography of the press, and
although later studies do not abound, they include comprehensive articles by Colin Franklin, James G. Nelson, and other scholars. In 2011, David Chambers and Martyn Ould produced addenda to the Madan bibliography (*The Daniel Press in Frome*); Ould also described the rejected sheets from the press that are located at Worcester College Library (*Printing at the Daniel Press*). These, and some other recent findings in the collection of Wormsley Library and the archive of Daniel’s granddaughter prompted William and Sylvia Peterson to embark on this project.

Obviously, the first census served several goals, and quickly became to be appreciated by academics, collectors and book dealers. On the face of it, the second book seems to have less relevance. Apart from the introductory remarks about new materials that came to light, the authors don’t mention a particular objective that this new census is supposed to serve. For the Kelmscott Press the census was believed to inspire new interpretations concerning the significance of the Chaucer edition. One way of doing that, according to the authors, was ‘to examine what happened after publication’, and this involved questions such as: ‘How was the edition sold? Who bought the book, and why? More specifically, what sorts of collectors were drawn to the Chaucer? How often did the copies change hands? How many were rebound, and when? What was the general pattern of migration from England to other countries? Which country today owns the most copies? And on a more practical level: how often do they become available today, and how much would a prospective buyer have to pay now for this book?’ (*The Kelmscott Chaucer: A Census*, pp. xi-xii).

The last question was relatively easy to answer; the price of an ordinary copy of the Chaucer could amount to €55,000. For the other questions, Peterson and Peterson collected substantial material in order to compile statistics about present locations; they traced almost 300 copies. The primary emphasis was on the collectors, and the authors stated: ‘For us, provenance has proven to be not a dull, technical term but a window into the fascinating human stories that lie behind nearly every copy of the Chaucer:’ (p. xv).

*The Garland of Rachel* involves small numbers, less statistics and only a few acquisition stories, but, as in its predecessor, the collectors, bookbinders, and recipients are presented in short illustrated biographies. The book also contains chapters on ‘The Daniels and Their Press’, ‘The Garland and Its Contributors’, and the correspondence related to its publication. However, a bibliographical description of this rarity is not immediately given. We are told that the book’s typography has ‘a distinctly improvisational quality about it’ (p. 28). The text was set in the Fell type that had been unearthed from the vast store rooms of the Oxford University Press while Daniel was in search of a suitable archaic type for his press; he couldn’t afford a proprietary type. We are informed that