You Don't Know JS Yet: Scope & Closures - 2nd Edition

Chapter 2: Understanding Lexical Scope

In Chapter 1, we explored how scope is determined at code compilation, a model called "lexical scope".

Before we get to the nuts and bolts of how using lexical scope in our programs, we should make sure we have a good conceptual foundation for how scope works. This chapter will illustrate *scope* with several metaphors. The goal here is to *think* about how your program is handled by the JS engine in ways that more closely match how the JS engine actually works.

Buckets, and Bubbles, and Marbles... Oh My!

One metaphor I've found effective in understanding scope is sorting colored marbles into buckets of their matching color.

Imagine you come across a pile of marbles, and notice that all the marbles are colored red, blue, or green. To sort all the marbles, let's drop the red ones into a red bucket, green into a green bucket, and blue into a blue bucket. After sorting, when you later need a green marble, you already know the green bucket is where to go to get it.

In this metaphor, the marbles are the variables in our program. The buckets are scopes (functions and blocks), which we just conceptually assign individual colors for our discussion purposes. The color of each marble is thus determined by which *color* scope we find the marble originally created in.

Let's annotate the program example from Chapter 1 with scope color labels:

```
// loop scope: GREEN

if (student.id == studentID) {
    return student.name;
}
}

var nextStudent = getStudentName(73);

console.log(nextStudent);
// Suzy
```

We've designated 3 scope colors with code comments: RED (outermost global scope), BLUE (scope of function getStudentName(...), and GREEN (scope of/inside the for loop). But it still may be difficult to recognize the boundaries of these scope buckets when looking at a code listing.

Figure 1 tries to make the scope boundaries easier to visualize by drawing colored bubbles around each scope:

Fig. 1: Nested Scope Bubbles

- 1. **Bubble 1** (RED) encompasses the global scope, which has three identifiers/variables: students (line 1), getStudentName (line 8), and nextStudent (line 16).
- 2. **Bubble 2** (BLUE) encompasses the scope of the function getStudentName(...) (line 8), which has just one identifier/variable: the parameter studentID (line 8).
- 3. **Bubble 3** (GREEN) encompasses the scope of the for-loop (line 9), which has just one identifier/variable: student (line 9).

Scope bubbles are determined during compilation based on where the functions / blocks of scope are written, the nesting inside each other, etc. Each scope bubble is entirely contained within its parent scope bubble – a scope is never partially in two different outer scopes.

Each marble (variable/identifier) is colored based on which bubble (bucket) it's declared in, not the color of the scope it may be accessed from (e.g., students on line 9 and studentID on line 10).

```
NOTE: |
:---|
```

Remember we asserted in Chapter 1 that id, name, and log are all properties, not variables; in other words, they're not marbles in buckets, so they don't get

colored based on any the rules we're discussing in this book. To understand how such property accesses are handled, see Book 3 $Objects \ & Classes$.

As the JS engine processes a program (during compilation), and finds a declaration for a variable, it essentially asks, "which *color* scope (bubble, bucket) am I currently in?" The variable is designated as that same *color*, meaning it belongs to that bucket/bubble.

The GREEN bucket is wholly nested inside of the BLUE bucket, and similarly the BLUE bucket is wholly nested inside the RED bucket. Scopes can nest inside each other as shown, to any depth of nesting as your program needs.

References (non-declarations) to variables/identifiers can be made from either the current scope, or any scope above/outside the current scope, but never to lower/nested scopes. So an expression in the RED bucket only has access to RED marbles, not BLUE or GREEN. An expression in the BLUE bucket can reference either BLUE or RED marbles, not GREEN. And an expression in the GREEN bucket has access to RED, BLUE, and GREEN marbles.

We can conceptualize the process of determining these non-declaration marble colors during runtime as a lookup. Since the students variable reference in the for-loop statement on line 9 is not a declaration, it has no color. So we ask the current scope bucket (BLUE) if it has a marble matching that name. Since it doesn't, the lookup continues with the next outer/containing scope (RED). The RED bucket has a marble of the name students, so the loop-statement's students variable is determined to be a RED marble.

The if (student.id == studentID) on line 10 is similarly determined to reference a GREEN marble named student and a BLUE marble studentID.

```
NOTE: |
:---|
```

The JS engine doesn't generally determine these marble colors during run-time; the "lookup" here is a rhetorical device to help you understand the concepts. During compilation, most or all variable references will be from already-known scope buckets, so their color is determined at that, and stored with each marble reference to avoid unnecessary lookups as the program runs. More on this in the next chapter.

The key take-aways from marbles & buckets (and bubbles!):

- Variables are declared in certain scopes, which can be thought of as colored marbles in matching-color buckets.
- Any reference to a variable of that same name in that scope, or any deeper nested scope, will be a marble of that same color unless an intervening scope "shadows" the variable declaration; see Chapter 3 "Shadowing.
- The determination of colored buckets, and the marbles they contain, happens during compilation. This information is used for variable (marble color) "lookups" during code execution.

A Conversation Among Friends

Another useful metaphor for the process of analyzing variables and the scopes they come from is to imagine various conversations that go on inside the engine as code is processed and then executed. We can "listen in" on these conversations to get a better conceptual foundation for how scopes work.

Let's now meet the members of the JS engine that will have conversations as they process that program:

- Engine: responsible for start-to-finish compilation and execution of our JavaScript program.
- 2. Compiler: one of Engine's friends; handles all the dirty work of parsing and code-generation (see previous section).
- 3. Scope Manager: another friend of Engine; collects and maintains a look-up list of all the declared variables/identifiers, and enforces a set of rules as to how these are accessible to currently executing code.

For you to *fully understand* how JavaScript works, you need to begin to *think* like *Engine* (and friends) think, ask the questions they ask, and answer their questions likewise.

To explore these conversations, recall again our running program example:

```
var students = [
    { id: 14, name: "Kyle" },
    { id: 73, name: "Suzy" },
    { id: 112, name: "Frank" },
    { id: 6, name: "Sarah" }
];
function getStudentName(studentID) {
    for (let student of students) {
        if (student.id == studentID) {
            return student.name;
        }
    }
}
var nextStudent = getStudentName(73);
console.log(nextStudent);
// Suzy
```

Let's examine how JS is going to process that program, specifically starting with the first statement. The array and its contents are just basic JS value literals (and thus unaffected by any scoping concerns), so our focus here will be on the var students = [. .] declaration and initialization-assignment parts.

We typically think of that as a single statement, but that's not how our friend *Engine* sees it. In fact, *Engine* sees two distinct operations, one which *Compiler* will handle during compilation, and the other which *Engine* will handle during execution.

The first thing *Compiler* will do with this program is perform lexing to break it down into tokens, which it will then parse into a tree (AST).

Once *Compiler* gets to code-generation, there's more detail to consider than may be obvious. A reasonable assumption would be that *Compiler* will produce code for the first statement such as: "Allocate memory for a variable, label it students, then stick a reference to the array into that variable." But there's more to it.

Here's how Compiler will handle that statement:

- 1. Encountering var students, Compiler will ask Scope Manager to see if a variable named students already exists for that particular scope bucket. If so, Compiler would ignore this declaration and move on. Otherwise, Compiler will produce code that (at execution time) asks Scope Manager to create a new variable called students in that scope bucket.
- 2. Compiler then produces code for Engine to later execute, to handle the students = [] assignment. The code Engine runs will first ask Scope Manager if there is a variable called students accessible in the current scope bucket. If not, Engine keeps looking elsewhere (see "Nested Scope" below). Once Engine finds a variable, it assigns the reference of the [. .] array to it.

In conversational form, the first-phase of compilation for the program might play out between *Compiler* and *Scope Manager* like this:

Compiler: Hey Scope Manager (of the global scope), I found a formal declaration for an identifier called **students**, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Nope, haven't heard of it, so I've just now created it for you.

Compiler: Hey Scope Manager, I found a formal declaration for an identifier called getStudentName, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Nope, but I just created it for you.

Compiler: Hey Scope Manager, getStudentName points to a function, so we need a new scope bucket.

(Function) Scope Manager: Got it, here it is.

Compiler: Hey Scope Manager (of the function), I found a formal parameter declaration for studentID, ever heard of it?

(Function) Scope Manager: Nope, but now it's registered in this scope.

Compiler: Hey Scope Manager (of the function), I found a for-loop that will need its own scope bucket.

. . .

The conversation is a question-and-answer exchange, where **Compiler** asks the current *Scope Manager* if an encountered identifier declaration has already been encountered? If "no", *Scope Manager* creates that variable in that scope. If the answer were "yes", then it would effectively be skipped over since there's nothing more for that *Scope Manager* to do.

Compiler also signals when it runs across functions or block scopes, so that a new scope bucket and Scope Manager can be instantiated.

Later, when it comes to execution of the program, the conversation will proceed between *Engine* and *Scope Manager*, and might play out like this:

Engine: Hey *Scope Manager* (of the global scope), before we begin, can you lookup the identifier getStudentName so I can assign this function to it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Yep, here you go.

Engine: Hey *Scope Manager*, I found a *target* reference for students, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Yes, it was formally declared for this scope, and it's already been initialized to undefined, so it's ready to assign to. Here you go.

Engine: Hey Scope Manager (of the global scope), I found a target reference for nextStudent, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Yes, it was formally declared for this scope, and it's already been initialized to undefined, so it's ready to assign to. Here you go.

Engine: Hey Scope Manager (of the global scope), I found a source reference for getStudentName, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Yes, it was formally declared for this scope. Here you go.

Engine: Great, the value in getStudentName is a function, so I'm going to execute it.

Engine: Hey *Scope Manager*, now we need to instantiate the function's scope.

. . .

This conversation is another question-and-answer exchange, where *Engine* first asks the current *Scope Manager* to lookup the hoisted getStudentName identifier, so as to associate the function with it. *Engine* then proceeds to ask *Scope Manager* about the *target* reference for students, and so on.

To review and summarize how a statement like var students = [..] is processed, in two distinct steps:

- 1. Compiler sets up the declaration of the scope variable (since it wasn't previously declared in the current scope).
- 2. While *Engine* is executing, since the declaration has an initialization assignment, *Engine* asks *Scope Manager* to look up the variable, and assigns to it once found.

Nested Scope

When it comes time to execute the getStudentName() function, *Engine* asks for a *Scope Manager* instance for that function's scope, and it will then proceed to lookup the parameter (studentID) to assign the 73 argument value to, and so on.

The function scope for getStudentName(...) is nested inside the global scope. The block scope of the for-loop is similarly nested inside that function scope. Scopes can be lexically nested to any arbitrary depth as the program defines.

Each scope gets its own *Scope Manager* instance each time that scope is executed (one or more times). Each scope automatically has all its identifiers registered (this is called "variable hoisting"; see Chapter 3).

At the beginning of a scope, if any identifier came from a function declaration, that variable is automatically initialized to its associated function reference. And if any identifier came from a var declaration (as opposed to let / const), that variable is automatically initialized to undefined so that it can be used; otherwise, the variable remains uninitialized (aka, in its "TDZ", see Chapter 3) and cannot be used until its declaration-and-initialization are executed.

In the for (let student of students) { statement, students is a *source* reference that must be looked up. But how will that lookup be handled, since the scope of the function will not find such an identifier.

To understand that, let's imagine that bit of conversation playing out like this:

Engine: Hey Scope Manager (for the function), I have a source reference for students, ever heard of it?

(Function) Scope Manager: Nope, never heard of it. Try the next outer scope.

Engine: Hey Scope Manager (for the global scope), I have a source reference for students, ever heard of it?

(Global) Scope Manager: Yep, it was formally declared, here you go.

. . .

One of the most important aspects of lexical scope is that any time an identifier reference cannot be found in the current scope, the next outer scope in the nesting is consulted; that process is repeated until an answer is found or there are no more scopes to consult.

Lookup Failures

When Engine exhausts all lexically available scopes and still cannot resolve the lookup of an identifier, an error condition then exists. However, depending on the mode of the program (strict-mode or not) and the role of the variable (i.e., target vs. scope; see Chapter 1), this error condition will be handled differently.

If the variable is a *source*, an unresolved identifier lookup is considered an undeclared (unknown, missing) variable, which results in a ReferenceError

being thrown. Also, if the variable is a *target*, and the code at that point is running in strict-mode, the variable is considered undeclared and throws a ReferenceError.

```
WARNING: |
```

The error message for an undeclared variable condition, in most JS environments, will likely say, "Reference Error: XYZ is not defined". The phrase "not defined" seems almost identical to the term "undefined", as far as the English language goes. But these two are very different in JS, and this error message unfortunately creates a likely confusion. "Not defined" really means "not declared", or rather "undeclared", as in a variable that was never formally declared in any lexically available scope. By contrast, "undefined" means a variable was found (declared), but the variable otherwise has no value in it at the moment, so it defaults to the undefined value. Yes, this terminology mess is confusing and terribly unfortunate.

However, if the variable is a *target* and strict-mode is not in effect, a confusing and surprising legacy behavior occurs. The extremely unfortunate outcome is that the global scope's *Scope Manager* will just create an **accidental global variable** to fulfill that target assignment!

```
function getStudentName() {
    // assignment to an undeclared variable :(
    nextStudent = "Suzy";
}
getStudentName();
console.log(nextStudent);
// "Suzy" -- oops, an accidental-global variable!
```

This sort of accident (almost certain to lead to bugs eventually) is a great example of the protections of strict-mode, and why it's such a bad idea not to use it. Never rely on accidental global variables like that. Always use strict-mode, and always formally declare your variables. You'll then get a helpful ReferenceError if you ever mistakenly try to assign to a not-declared variable.

Building On Metaphors

Yuck.

To visualize nested scope resolution, yet another useful metaphor may be an office building:

```
Fig. 2: Scope "Building"
```

The building represents our program's nested scope rule set. The first floor of the building represents the currently executing scope. The top level of the building is the global scope.

You resolve a *target* or *source* variable reference by first looking on the current floor, and if you don't find it, taking the elevator to the next floor, looking there, then the next, and so on. Once you get to the top floor (the global scope), you either find what you're looking for, or you don't. But you have to stop regardless.

Continue The Conversation

By this point, hopefully you feel more solid on what scope is and how the JS engine determines it while compiling your code.

Before *continuing*, go find some code in one of your projects and run through the conversations. If you find yourself confused or tripped up, spend time reviewing this material.

As we move forward, we want to look in much more detail at how we use lexical scope in our programs.