Namskoje, an der Bucht Tjunge-törde und in der Umgegend von Jakutsk sowohl typische picea als auch Übergänge zu var. gagatoides gefunden wurden.»

Karawaiew thus regards gagatoides as belonging to the species picea Nyl. Ruzsky described it as a variety of fusca L., and it seems more likely that it must be more closely related to this, and not to picea, a species well known to Ruzsky, yet he called it gagates (Karawaiew 1926 p. 197). Since Ruzsky gave the name gagatoides to a variety of fusca, it must be because it was more shiny, i. e. had more sparse pubescence, than fusca, thus resembling gagates picea.

The Norwegian specimens fully agree with specimens from Northern Russia (and Siberia, see above), and thus no doubt must be Ruzsky's gagatoides.

In his description, Ruzsky evidently has drawn attention to only one difference between gagatoides and fusca, saying that the first had a more shiny gaster. Later authors have cited Ruzsky without having seen any specimens of gagatoides themselves, and finally gagatoides has been transferred to picea Nyl., as a variety of this species.

As Karawaiew indicates, he has only regarded the pubescence and the frontal area, and does not show any interest in bristles or scale, and — besides — he has only used $\nabla \nabla$ for his classifications. Personally I have the pleasure of possessing several $\sigma \sigma$ taken in nests together with $\nabla \nabla$, and as will be seen from the following description, the males are perhaps still more characteristic than the $\nabla \nabla$, and differ distincly from the males of fusca and — especially — picea. Thus the $\sigma \sigma$ highly support my conviction that gagatoides is a good species, and not so closely related to picea as some authors have previously supposed.