He is a few fries short of a Happy Meal
A study of the semantic and syntactic properties of idiomatic expressions with the structure $X \text{(be)}(\text{quantifier}) Y \text{ short/shy of } Z$. 
Abstract

This study is an investigation of how semantic and syntactic properties interact in a regular way in variants of a common expression type or Snowclone. Conventional variants of this construction are (someone is) a few (French) fries short/shy of a Happy Meal, (someone is) one sandwich short of a picnic and (someone is) one card short of a full deck. All the instances of the expression examined here have the same structure: X (be)(quantifier) Y short/shy of Z.

The research questions used when analysing this construction are the following: What are the specific semantic and syntactic properties found in the expression X (be) (quantifier) Y short/shy of Z? What characterises the interaction between these properties? Is there any significance in how they interact for the meaning expressed by specific examples of this construction?

The focus is on variants of the construction which have the same or quite similar idiomatic meaning. These are part of an expression group called “Fulldeckisms”, and they are used for stating that someone is mentally inadequate, mildly insane, or that something is not up to standard in a euphemistic and humoristic manner (Moon 1998, p. 159). The context in which the expression is used is important for its regularly metaphorical interpretation. However, what is interesting is that the construction itself appears to be an equally important recognisable factor for this metaphorical interpretation. The formulaic construction, previous cultural knowledge, and a certain level of cognitive ability are required for users of English to interpret the metaphor. The variants discussed have different literal or source meanings, but they all have the same kind of figurative or target meaning. The literal meanings cover a wide range of discourse or cognitive domains. However, the specific source domains appear to be almost irrelevant for forming the figurative meaning as long as the constraints on certain semantic and syntactic features of this expression are observed.
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1. Introduction
There is a type of idiomatic expression that seems fairly common among native speakers of English. These expressions have been named “Fulldeckisms”, and they are euphemistic and humoristic ways for indicating mental inadequacy, mild insanity, or that something is not up to standard (Moon 2001, p. 160). Various websites on the Internet are dedicated to the collection of different variants of this expression or construction type. As they are called “Fulldeckisms”, one could assume that they originate from the expression (someone/something) (be) a few cards short of a full deck, but there is insufficient proof to confirm this. Within the category of “Fulldeckisms” one finds expressions with the construction: X (be) (quantifier) Y short of a Z; for example He is a few fries short of a Happy Meal. “Fulldeckisms” of this character will be examined in this paper.

In the construction, or type of idiom, investigated here there seems thus to be a regular kind of interplay between certain semantic and syntactic properties. It was on the basis of this observation that a both qualitative and quantitative study was performed in order to determine whether the metaphorical interpretations of variants of the construction X (be) (quantifier) Y short of a Z are in any way affected by this interplay. The most common type of example of this construction was (be) a few fries short of a Happy Meal, and therefore this variant will be used in discussions throughout the paper. X (be) (quantifier) Y short of a Z will be referred to as “the expression” or “the construction” in the paper.

The aim of this paper is firstly, to provide a background study of the expression and discuss the empirical material. Secondly, the semantic and the syntactic properties will be analysed from within a theoretical framework oriented to the study of metaphor and idioms from a cognitive perspective.

1.1 Origin of the expression
The earliest detectable trace of this metaphorically used construction in literature is in Colonel Godfrey Mundy's *Our Antipodes* published in 1852: "The climate is productive of chronic diseases rather than acute ones. Let no man having, in colonial phrase, 'a shingle short' try this country. He will pass his days in Tarban Creek Asylum." (Phrase Finder)

Another example is found in the book *Neath Swaying Spars* by the New Zealand author Percy Allan Eaddy, published in 1939. “The old captain...must have been what some people term / a hapenny short of a shilling/”. (Oxford English Dictionary) The words “what some people term” suggests that the expression might already have been in use for a period of time before being included in this book. This 'short of' insult is said to have begun in Australasia in the 19th century (Phrase Finder).

Another example is fairly recent: *A sandwich short of a picnic*. The first citation of it that has been documented is from the BBC's Lenny Henry Christmas Special, in December 1987. In that TV show the comedian Henry performed *I'm Mad*, a spoof song and dance routine that aped Michael Jackson's 1983 hit *Bad*. “He's mad, mad, one brick short of a load/He's mad, mad, one sandwich short of a picnic” (Phrase Finder).

2. Research questions

What are the specific semantic and syntactic properties found in the expression *X (be) (quantifier) Y short/shy of Z*? What characterises the interaction between these properties? Is there any significance in how they interact for the meaning expressed by specific examples of this construction?

3. Empirical material
3.1. Corpus study

The following corpora were used in the study: Mark Davies’ online versions of the Time Corpus, the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) versions. The Internet and in particular Google were useful for finding examples of the studied construction. The examples appeared most frequently on various canonical lists of “Fulldeckisms” posted on the Internet. On these websites people have been asked to add suggestions of variants of these “Fulldeskisms” that they have heard of.

According to the research done for this project, variants of the studied expression appear more often in blogs than in other forms of writing. The limited amount of traces of the expression in the corpora suggests this. This could indicate that variants of the expression are used more in informal discourse than formal texts. In the corpora two examples of *a few fries short of a Happy Meal* were found, while there were approximately 7,700 Google examples of variants of this expression. This search was done with the exclusion of the following words, *list, cliché, clichés, collection, dictionary, idioms,* and *euphemism.* This was done in order to eliminate websites with dictionary entries or lists in which the expression appears. There are, however, limitations in the accuracy of these results, as it is possible that some double entries exist in this search. The canonical lists of Fuldeckisms, in particular the list maintained by Silverstein (2003), proved to be the most reliable in finding examples.

The corpus study was thus not effective in determining the frequency of use of variants of this expression and in finding sufficient amount of text in order to study the context in which these variants are used. There are numerous reasons for this. Few examples of the expression were found on corpora, and there was only a copy of the paragraph in which the expression is used. For copyright purposes, corpora may not provide the full text in which the expression occurs. The empirical study had to rely on the Internet for finding examples of variants of the expression and finding the most commonly used variants.

3.2. Data Statistics
139 of “Fulldeckisms” with the construction X (be) (quantifier) Y short/shy of a Z were selected and collected. These were then divided into a hierarchy of categories or cognitive domains according to their lexical properties. They were firstly divided into cultural and natural domains. Those categorised as cultural domains have evidence of human intervention in the meaning of the lexemes used in the expressions, while those categorised as natural domains do not exhibit any such evidence. The following is an example of a cultural kind domain: a few fries short of a Happy Meal, and the next one exemplifies natural kinds: a few colours short of a rainbow.

The cultural kind category was further divided into more specific kinds based on the lexical content of the expressions. For example, a French fry short of Happy Meal was categorized under food, while one card short of a full deck was placed under games. The categorisation was based on the lexical content of the two nominal groups labelled Y and Z in the general formula for the construction. In most cases these nominal categories belong to the same cognitive domain. However, it is important to note that some of the examples are clearly a mixture of kinds, where one nominal category falls into a different cognitive domain than the other; for example “a doughnut short of being a cop” and “a tree short of a hammock”. These were then placed in a separate group entitled multiple (see appendix A).

4. Semantic properties
4.1. Metaphor

Literal meaning supplies the building blocks of thought. "Cognitive models derive their fundamental meaningfulness directly from their ability to match up with pre-conceptual structure. Such direct matchings provide a basis for an account of truth and knowledge" (Lakoff, 1987, p. 303).

However, literal meaning cannot capture the range of all kinds. "In kinds where there is no clearly discernible pre-conceptual structure to our experience, we import such structure via metaphor. Metaphor provides us with a means of comprehending domains of experience that do not have a pre-conceptual structure of their own” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 303). Pre-conceptual structures are thus mapped from source meaning onto target meaning. This is also relevant in the studied expression as there is no discernable pre-conceptual structure for being mentally inadequate or mildly insane. To use the word *crazy*, for example, as a synonym for *Y short/shy of a Z* would be too blunt, or even hyperbolic, and the euphemistic tone of the expression would be lost.

In *a few fries short of a Happy Meal* the source meaning is the literal interpretation of this phrase: that a few fries are missing in order for there to be a whole or complete Happy Meal. There is a deficiency or partial lack of something needed to complete a whole. This sense of deficiency in the source meaning is mapped onto a more abstracted or figurative interpretation. More specifically, the sense of deficiency is mapped onto a characterisation of someone’s cognitive capacity. Metaphorically it is used to indicate the inability to effectively use one’s cognitive skills in the appropriate way. So here only one feature of the source meaning is mapped onto the target meaning, the feature of deficiency. Actually, the literal meaning is not necessarily completely logical. In reality it is still possible to have a Happy Meal without a few fries. However, it is this illogicality that triggers the humoristic side of this expression. This in turn further emphasises the sense of stupidity or lack of mental ability in an ironic manner.
Mappings from different source meanings can lead to the same target domain. What is interesting is that, in the case of this metaphor, the source domains which can be used are limitless. In fact, the domains used are almost irrelevant in recognising the metaphorical meaning.

Variants of the expression seem for the most part to be closer to being internal metaphors. In other words, their intended figurative status is directly evident from the combination of words within the syntactic string (Alm-Arvius, 2003, pp. 115ff); for example, *a few pickles short of a jar, a few bricks short of a wall*. In these examples it is not necessary to literally have a specific amount of the kind of thing specified in the $Y$ slot, i.e. *pickles and bricks*, to complete the variables in $Z$, i.e. *jar and wall*. Some examples are however external metaphors, as they could in principle also be given a literal interpretation in another context; for example, *a few inches short of a foot; one kopek short of a ruble*.

### 4.2. Image schemas

Image schemas are very general spatial, bodily-based conceptual structures such as the notions of path, force and container. It is out of these basic cognitive tools that more complex cognitive models of reality are constructed according to cognitive semanticists. These models are created through categorisation. Image schemas connect a source domain with a target domain in a metaphor (Lakoff, 1993, pp. 215ff; Lakoff and Johnson, 1999, pp. 35ff, 113).

Within the analysed construction we find container schemas. In the container schema we place material objects and abstract thoughts that are both characteristically considered to be three dimensional. We have three containers in the expression *He is a few fries short of a Happy Meal: X = he, Y = a few fries and Z = Happy meal.*

Furthermore, we have a container within another container: $Y$ is a container within $Z$. 
The path schema is a line in space on which containers can move along (Alm-Arvius, work in progress, p.22). It may be relevant for our understanding of this expression as our attention moves from the subject, *He*, to the subject complement that characterises him, *a few fries short of a Happy Meal.*

| X, Y and Z |
| Containers |
| (to be) and short/shy of |
| Path |

*He is a few fries short of a Happy Meal*

**Containers:** *He, a few fries, a Happy Meal*

**Path:** *is short/shy of*

### 4.2.1. The Invariance Principle

The image-schemas characterizing the source domains (containers, path) of the type of metaphorical expression analysed in this paper are mapped onto the target domains (categories, linear scale). This observation has resulted in a hypothesis, formulated by George Lakoff, called *The Invariance Principle*. It says that metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (the image-schema structure) of the source domain, in a way coherent with the underlying structure of the target domain. This principle ensures that, for container schemas, interiors will be mapped onto interiors, exteriors onto exteriors, and boundaries onto boundaries. For the path schema, sources will be mapped onto sources, goals onto goals, trajectories onto trajectories; and so on (Lakoff, 1993, pp. 202–251). The path schema is always the same in the expression. The containers are variable both as regards X, i.e. who is characterised, and as regards Y and Z. For example, in the expression *one sandwich short of a picnic* the containers of *sandwich* and *picnic* can be replaced by containers that have another type pf meronymic relationship (see 4.7) like *fries* and a *Happy Meal*. This is relevant in the expression as the image-schematic structure preserves
the mapping of the concept of deficiency in the metaphor. It is the invariance in the relationship between the containers and the path that is essential to the metaphorical mapping taking place in the expression.

4.3. Cognitive Domains

Lakoff (1987, p. 302) argues that "directly meaningful concepts are more or less the same for all human beings and therefore provide certain fixed points in the objective evaluation of situations". He also suggests that experience makes it possible to develop preconceptual structures. These are divided into basic-level structures and image-schema structures, and Lakoff recognises that there may be other types. Basic-level structures arise "as a result of our capacities for gestalt perception, mental imagery, and motor movement" and are apparent as basic-level categories such as pain and hunger, water, wood, and stone, people and cats etc (Lakoff 1987, p. 302).

On the basis of this theory, the variants of the studied expression were divided into cognitive domains in order to determine whether there is any significance or relevance in the types of cognitive domains used.

The results showed that an overwhelming majority of the variants of the expression have cultural kinds (institutionalised) source domains, more precisely 130, while only 7 were natural kinds; for example, “one song short of a musical”, cultural, and “one shade short of a rainbow”, a natural kind. So an interesting result was the low number of variants of the expression that fall under the category of natural kinds (hard facts). This could indicate that this is more a part of urban discourse than rural discourse. Within cultural kinds, the food kind is by far the most common with 26 variants of the expression. One could speculate that the reason for this is that all people can relate to the domain of food in one way or another, while not all can necessarily relate to the domain of sport. Therefore, it becomes more effective to use the expression within the domain of food. The fact that the majority of variants are in cultural domains indicates that the expression can easily be adapted to many cultural experiences.

Lakoff suggests that “thought is embodied; that is, the structures used to put together our conceptual systems grow out of bodily experience and make sense in terms of it. The core of our conceptual systems is directly grounded in perception, body
movement, and experience of a physical and social character.” (Lakoff, 1987, p. xiv)
These conceptual systems are part of the network of thought in which cognitive
creativity exists. The fact that there are so many variants of this expression suggests
this. Lakoff further describes the properties of conceptual structure in the following
way.

• “Thought is imaginative, in that those concepts which are not directly
  grounded in concrete experience employ metaphor, metonymy, and mental
  imagery – all of which go beyond the literal mirroring, or representation of
  external reality. It is this imaginative capacity that allows for “abstract”,
  thought and takes the mind beyond what we can see and feel. The imaginative
  capacity is also embodied – indirectly – since the metaphors, metonymies, and
  images are based on experience, often bodily experience. Thought is also
  imaginative in a less obvious way: every time we categorize something in a way
  that does not mirror nature, we are using general human imaginative
  capacities.”

• “Thought has gestalt properties and is thus not atomistic; concepts have an
  overall structure that goes beyond merely putting together conceptual
  “building blocks” by general rules.”

• “Thought has an ecological structure. The efficiency of cognitive processing, as
  in learning and memory, depends on the overall structure of the conceptual
  system and on what the concepts mean. Thought is thus more than just the
  mechanical manipulation of abstract symbols.” (Lakoff, 1987 pp xiv-xv)

All of the above applies to the expression examined in this essay; users employ
metaphor, metonymy, and mental imagery that go beyond literal mirroring. The
variants of the expression demonstrate the great imaginative capacities we have in
language. The expression is reliant on conceptual “building blocks”, but the process
of thought goes beyond this. Most importantly, the expression always has the same
kind of meaning and its overall conceptual structure is always the same. There is
an interrelationship here between the meaning and conceptual system.
4.4. Idioms

The construction can be considered a variable kind of idiom. It has internal syntactic structure and a conventional form, but it is also internally variable, and it represents a complex meaning (Cf. Alm-Arvius, 2006, p. 19). The idiomatic part of this construction is \( X (be)(quantifier) Y \text{ short/shy of } Z \), and there seems to be general agreement concerning the status of the prefabricated construction.

The expression is also one of a few cases where the lexis is routinely varied without any apparent limits, while the frame or syntactic structure and the pragmatic or discoursal intention remain fixed. (Moon, 1998, p. 160)

4.5. Idiom Variation

In idiom variation, for example of \textit{Love is a journey}, the metaphorical meaning changes if a lexical item is changed, for example \textit{Love is a battlefield}. In the case of the expression examined here, it was important to determine whether this applies. In the above examples the source would be the literal meaning of \textit{journey} and \textit{battlefield} respectively. Characteristics from the sources are transferred to \textit{Love} in both cases. The result is that these metaphors have different meanings. The key to this is that the words \textit{journey} and \textit{battlefield} belong to different cognitive domains. However, in the expression studied the metaphorical meaning does not change with variation of the words used. This is what separates this expression from other idioms. The variation of semantic properties does not change the metaphorical meaning.

4.5.1. Idiom clipping

A type of idiom variation called idiom clipping occurs in the use of some variants of the studied expression, for example: \textit{a few fries short...} This suggests that the variant is firmly entrenched in the vocabulary of the users. “The core part of this expression is all that is needed to trigger idiomatic meaning” (Alm Arvius, work in progress, p 155). That users of the expression understand the meaning of the metaphor also when a number of lexemes are omitted shows that they have sufficient knowledge of it.
However, idiom clipping in the other less common variants was not found. The use for example of “a few bytes short...”, as in “a few bytes short of a full 256K SIMM”, might only be comprehensible within the discourse of computing. Therefore, it seems that the more commonly used variants are more likely to be clipped.

4.6. Snowclone

A snowclone is a particular kind of cliché first defined by Pullum (in his book *The great Eskimo vocabulary hoax*, published in 1991) in which the following example is mentioned, “If Eskimos have N words for snow, X surely has Y words for Z”. Another example is “X is the new Y.” The short definition of this neologism might be *n. fill-in-the-blank headline*. (O’Connor, n.d.)

Snowclones are language patterns with open slots which are in some sense formulaic. There are all sorts of language patterns like this: syntactic constructions, idioms, clichés, catchphrases, riddles and joke forms, poetic forms, etc. People also make playful allusions to idioms, clichés, quotations, and titles, varying parts of the models for effect. These are instantly recognisable phrasal templates that can be customised to suit a particular discourse. An example of a snowclone is “X is the new Y”. X and Y may be replaced with new words or phrases – for example, “white is the new black”, and “comedy is the new rock’n’roll”. Both the original formula and the new phrases produced from it are called Snowclones. It emphasizes the idea of a familiar formula and previous cultural knowledge of the reader to express information about an idea. The idea being discussed may be different in meaning from the original formula, but can be understood using the same trope as the original formulation (O’Connor, n.d.).

Snowclones are an example of the cognitive creativity of language users (see 4.1). The metaphorical part of the studied expression has been categorised in the Snowclone Database as a snowclone; *a few Y short/shy of a Y*. (O’Connor, n.d.)
4.7. Meronymy

One of the prerequisites for forming a metaphor of this construction is a meronymic relationship within the expression. One variable is usually a part of the other variable. For example, in the expression *a few fries short of a Happy Meal*, the fries form a part of the Happy Meal, the fries are a part while the Happy Meal is the whole. Variables are mostly collocated according to a meronymic relationship, but cases of deliberate incongruence do occur. Here the variables do not naturally collocate and do not have a meronymic relationship; for example “three fish short of a lawn mower”. In this example fish do not have a meronymic relationship with a lawn mower. In order for this to occur, speakers must have knowledge of the fact that a meronymic relationship is necessary in order to create the regular construction of the expression. This parasitic incoherence exaggerates the sense of humour and irony that already exists in conventional forms of the expression.

5. Syntactic properties

The examples that we take to be instances of the expression *X (be)(quantifier) Y short/shy of Z* have the same type of syntactic structure. X in this construction is the subject. The copula verb, *be*, is syntactically variable according to the subject and the time referred to. The obligatory part *short/shy of* is flanked by two NPs or nominal groups. The first of these contains a quantifier, for example *a* or *a few*. The second NP is in the singular form, consisting of the indefinite article and the head. This syntactic form is generally fixed when generating the metaphorical meaning previously discussed (see 4.1.).

subject + copula verb + quantifier + nominal group + short/shy of + nominal group

---

1 “The term meronymy stands for part-whole relationships between lexical items or, more specifically, between their senses (Alm-Arvius, 2003, p37).
5.1. **Construction grammar**

The conceptual, architectural and the rural basis of Construction Grammar is framed by the following hypotheses of Fried:

“(i) speakers rely on relatively complex meaning-form patterns – constructions – for building linguistic expressions;
(ii) linguistic expressions reflect the effects of interaction between constructions and the linguistic material, such as words, which occur in them; and
(iii) constructions are organized into networks of overlapping patterns related through shared properties” (Fried, 2004, pp. 11-13).

All of these hypotheses apply to the expression in question, and it can therefore be said be an example of a construction. In Construction Grammar, the notion of knowing a language means knowing its constructions. The active, the passive, the reflexive, the existential sentence types can all be seen as constructions, and so can the preposition phrase, or the verb phrase. Moreover, some constructions contain specific words, for instance the expression analysed in this paper. In fact, in the view of Construction Grammar, language is the inventory of its constructions (Fried, 2004, pp. 11-13).

5.2. **Valence**

The whole construction is an example of a copula sentence with the verb *be*. This verb is divalent as it has two arguments. This is a feature that is constant with every variant of the expression studied.

\[
X \quad be \quad Y \text{ short/shy of } Z \\
\text{arg. 1} \quad \text{divalent verb} \quad \text{arg. 2}
\]

However, within the second argument we also have a valence structure as *short/shy of* is divalent and takes two arguments.

\[
Y \quad \text{short/shy of} \quad Z \\
\text{arg. 1} \quad \text{divalent predicate} \quad \text{arg. 2}
\]
This structure is also influenced by the valence principle which “assures that all constituents appearing in local positions are in fact complements” (Fillmore and Kay, 1999, p. 10). In the expression studied the valence principle assures that constituents appearing in the local positions are compatible or at least possible complements (Fillmore and Kay, 1999, p. 10).

The fact that the described valence patterns are part of the construction of the expression means that the interplay between the syntactic and semantic properties is essential for its character.

6. Conclusion

The expression studied has the following qualities: It is an idiomatic expression which has obvious metaphor qualities. These qualities are most clearly defined by the meronymic relationship between the two variables in the $Y$ and $Z$ slots in the construction. In this metaphor, the mapping of certain features from multiple source domains always leads to the same target domain. The lexemes that can fill the $Y$ and $Z$ slots are almost infinitely variable as long as there is a meronymic relationship between them. This factor makes this expression different from metaphorical idioms of similar character. Another metaphorical snowclone, “X is the new Y”, does not have meronymic features. Nevertheless, they are similar in that the variables generally are constrained to the same domain. This is important for the mapping of features from the source domain to the target.

There are constraints on the form from a syntactic perspective. In the construction NP's must occur in the three slots $X$, $Y$ and $Z$, and the patterns of valence cannot be changed.

The constraints on the syntactic properties are instrumental for the semantic properties within this expression. If the syntactic form is changed in any way, then the semantic features are disturbed. The semantic features are conversely less constrained than the syntactic features, because even if the meronymic constraints are challenged, the metaphoric meaning still exists, for example in “a few fish short of...
a lawn mower”. This is possible because of the established target/metaphorical meaning of the expression. There is a relationship between the form and the metaphorical meaning, whereby the metaphorical meaning is reliant on the form. The fact that the vast majority of the variants are external metaphors strengthens this assumption.

There are three features which are essential in this expression. Firstly, cultural knowledge is important in interpreting the metaphor. This cultural knowledge is according to Lakoff acquired by experience or embodied reality. The cultural understanding that French fries are a part of a Happy Meal enables one to understand this common variant of the expression: *(someone is)* a few French fries *short of a Happy Meal*. This may seem to be obvious to many, but other variants, for example “a few stops short of Barking” may be more difficult to understand if the cultural knowledge of the London Underground and the meaning of the expression “barking mad” are not available. The cultural knowledge of the meronymic relation between the $X$ and $Y$ variables is essential in the understanding of these expressions. This is evident in the overwhelming number of cultural kinds, as opposed to natural kinds, found in this study. (See appendix A). The humoristic element of the expression studied is linked to the cultural knowledge of the users of the English language. Variants of this expression in another language and culture might not have the same humoristic qualities as it does in the English language. This point could be investigated in further studies.

Secondly, cognition is important in this expression. The ability to recognise a meronymic relationship between $Z$ and $Y$ and interpret it as a metaphoric signal, for a deficiency of some kind, requires cognitive skills. Creativity is a vital element in these cognitive skills for the creation of the many variants of this expression.

Thirdly, the formulaic construction of the expression must remain stable in order to maintain the metaphorical meaning despite the wide range of possible variants. Idiom variation shows this, as idiom clipping and meronymic incongruence in the variables of the expression do not disturb the metaphorical meaning.

In the usage of the expression there is a general interaction between the following:

*Cultural knowledge + cognition and creativity + formulaic construction.*
In conclusion, the metaphorical expression with the form $X \ (be)(quantifier)\ Y \ short/shy\ of\ Z$ is a clear example of collaborative interaction between semantic and syntactic properties. In other words, the semantic and syntactic properties work together in producing a lexically variable expression with one standard meaning.
7. References


Internet:


http://herbison.com/canon/fulldeck.html

http://snowclones.org/about/

Corpora

Time Corpus http://corpus.byu.edu/time/

Corpus of Contemporary American English http://www.americancorpus.org/

British Nation Corpus http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/

Oxford English Dictionary Corpus http://corpus.byu.edu/oed/