

```
TAP version 13
# (anonymous)
ok 1 Solution loaded
ok 2 The structure is correct

1..2
# tests 2
# pass 2

# ok

# Success!

You correctly created the variable bar, lexically scoped inside the function
foo(), great work.

-----

# Solution

For comparison, here is a possible solution, so you can compare notes:

    function foo() {
      var bar;
    }

# Next lesson

Execute @workshoppers/scope-chains-closures to move on to the next lesson: Scope
Chains.
```

```
TAP version 13
# (anonymous)
ok 1 Solution loaded
ok 2 The structure is correct
```

```
1..2
# tests 2
# pass 2

# ok
```

```
# Success!
```

You created a scope chain using lexical scoping and `var` statements!

```
# Solution
```

The scope chain you created now looks like this:

```
(global)
  ↑
  |
foo()
var bar
  ↑
  |
zip()
var quux
```

By following the arrows, we can see `zip()` has access to `var bar`, but not the other way around.

```
TAP version 13
# (anonymous)
ok 1 Solution loaded
ok 2 The structure is correct
```

```
1..2
# tests 2
# pass 2
```

```
# ok
```

```
# Success!
```

You assigned a value to `quux`, even though `foo()` doesn't have access to the `quux` inside `zip()`.

```
# Solution
```

The scope chain of the solution looks like this:

```
(global)
  quux
    ↑
    |
  foo()
var bar
    ↑
    |
  zip()
var quux
```

```
TAP version 13
# (anonymous)
ok 1 Solution loaded
ok 2 The structure is correct
```

```
1..2
# tests 2
# pass 2
```

```
# ok
```

```
# Success!
```

Awesome stuff - you closed over the variable `bar` inside `zip`, then returned `zip`.

```
# Solution
```

Let's look at the scope chain for your solution:

```
    foo()
    var bar
    return zip
      ↑
      |
    zip()
    bar = true
```

By referencing `bar` within `zip`, we have created a *Closure* where `zip()` closes over the variable `bar` from its parent scope `foo()`.

Since we are returning the function `zip`, the reference to `bar` is maintained (and hence the closure is maintained) until `zip` is no longer required.