

Similarly

today

thinking

Today, only a few scholars argue for the multiple authorship of Piers Plowman, most feeling that William Langland was the sole author.

It is true that the recently reprinted Cambridge History of English Literature still contains an old article advocating multiple authorship, but Helen Gardner in The Business of Criticism (Oxford: , 1959) ^{is hold to say:} says:

The importance of the single author and the single work dominates literary studies, as can be seen if the plan and treatment of the new Oxford History of English Literature, now in progress, is compared with that of the old Cambridge History (1911).

In Homeric studies there has been a strong shift toward the unity of the Iliad and the Odyssey, although many ^{still} think the two have different authors. Of course, no one argues that Homer made up his material from nothing, so there may well be sources behind Homer, but this does not ^{necessarily} deny the unity of authorship. C.M. Bowra, in Tradition and Design in the Iliad (1930, reprinted 1950, 1958, 1963) discusses ^{ing} the criticism of Homer, ~~where repetitions have been cited to show multiple authorship, he questions the method used to assign an earlier date to one of the passages.~~ He admits that the Iliad contains some inexplicable contradictions, but these ~~do more~~ ^{not} indicate multiple authorship: ~~than a fallible single author:~~

Homer's name, remembered and honoured, is perhaps the best evidence for his early fame and influence, and the best answer to those who think that the Iliad is the work of several great poets and several bunglers. Even the Odyssey in antiquity was sometimes taken from him, but the Iliad remained his ~~un~~scientific criticism strained at the gnat of some difficulties in composition, and swallowed the camel of multiple authorship. The credit for the Iliad rests primarily with Homer who gave the