Wilson 1955: 138; revived from synonymy and raised to species as the senior synonym of *L. crispus* Wilson: Kupyanskaya 1989: 785, w, q, m; Kupyanskaya 1990: 229; Bolton 1995: 222 ("Turkestan" is erroneously given as the type locality); Imai et al. 2003: 60.

***Material examined.*** Lectotype worker, "Okeanskaya nr. Vladivostok, Siberia, VIII-1926, N. Kusnetzov" (probably hand written by Wilson); "*Lasius fuliginosus capitatus* Kusnetzov LECTOTYPE" (hand written by Wilson); "M.C.Z. Type 30143" (MCZ, designated by Wilson, 1955); paralectotype worker, "Okeanskaya nr. Vladivostok, Siberia, VIII-1926, N. Kusnetzov" (hand written by Wilson); "Turkestan N. Kusnetzov" (Sic!) (printed original label from Kusnetzov's collection); "Lectotype nest series" (hand written by Wilson); "Cotype" (red printed label); "*Lasius fuliginosus capitatus* Kuzn.-Ugams. det. E. O. Wilson" (hand written by Wilson); "M.C.Z. Type 30143"; paralectotype worker, "*Acanthomyops fuliginosus orientalis* (= *capitatus* m.) Far East Station Okeanskaya near Vladivostok" (probably hand written by Kusnetzov); "Turkestan N. Kusnetzov" (Sic!) (original printed label from Kusnetzov's collection); "Lectotype nest series" (hand written by Wilson); "Cotype" (red printed label); "M.C.Z. Type 30143" (MCZ). Non-type material: 5 workers from the Russian Far East (IZK, BPI).

Labels of paralectotype specimens are misleading for the presence of the labels "Turkestan N. Kusnetzov" together with the locality "Far East Station Okeanskaya near Vladivostok". Probably it is simply a labelling error in Kusnetzov's collection.

Measurements and indices of the type specimens (data of the lectotype are in brackets): $HL_1$ = 1.25–1.29 (1.29), $HL_2$ = 1.32–1.36 (1.36), $HW_1$ = 1.22–1.27 (1.27), $HW_2$ = 0.78–0.85 (0.85), SL = 1.11–1.12 (1.12), OL = 0.24–0.27 (0.27), AL = 1.34–1.44 (1.44); CI = 0.97–1.00 (0.99), CLI = 1.05–1.07 (1.05), CWI = 1.49–1.59 (1.49), $SI_1$ = 0.87–0.89 (0.87), $SI_2$ = 0.89–0.92 (0.88), OI = 0.19–0.21 (0.21).

Queens and males are unknown.

***Diagnosis.*** Workers: petiolar scale (seen in profile) relatively thin, though not flattened at the top, approximately inversely V-shaped; when seen in front or from behind, it is slightly narrowing, not tapering to the dorsal crest; head with convex sides, gradually and slightly narrowing anteriorly, with rather shallowly emarginate occipital margin; scape, mid and hind tibiae not flattened, elliptical in cross-section; ratio of min/max diameters of the scape > 0.7; scape and legs with decumbent pilosity only; promesonotal dorsum and occipital margin with short and sparse standing hairs; third joint of maxillary palps is the longest, each following joint is somewhat longer than the next one; The combination of these features distinctly separates this species both from *L. nipponensis* (see above and Figs 1–7) and from *L. fuji* (see below and Figs 52–58).

***Notes.*** The type specimens of var. *capitatus* generally correspond to the original description, except that their petiolar scale is somewhat thicker than in Fig. 4 of Kusnetzov-Ugamsky (1928).

In my opinion, for several reasons *L. capitatus* had the most ambiguous taxonomic position among all *Dendrolasius* species. First of all, even the usage of the name "*capitatus*" was misleading. It was introduced by Kusnetzov-Ugamsky (1927) as *nomen nudum*. He wrote "*...Generally, this species* [e. g. *L. fuliginosus*] *is very stable on its characters; only the separate subspecies, recently described by me, A. fuliginosus capitatus, nov. (manuscript), lives in the Far East (South Ussuri Region)...*" (*loc. cit.*, p. 187). Later he has primarily used for this form the name "*Acanthomyops fuliginosus orientalis* Karawajew" and noted "*...all specimens of Acanth. (Dendrolasius) fuliginosus Latr., collected by me in Ussuri Region* [now – Primorsky Region of Russia], *belong to the separate taxonomic unit, which Karawajew described as separate subspecies. Discriminating features of this subspecies are: maxillary palps rather long, 6-jointed, their third joint is the longest, each subsequent joint is shorter than the preceding one...Head without emargination on the occipital margin, or, at most, very shallowly emarginate,... with broadly rounded occipital corners...Petiolar scale "flatty-rounded"* [I do not understand properly what the author correctly meant even in Russian] *...The main features* [e.g. separating this form from *L. fuliginosus*] *are: lack of the emargination on the occipital margin of the head and a different structure of the maxillary palps...*" (Kusnetzov-Ugamsky 1928, p. 17). Then, on p. 18 of that paper, the author unexpectedly used for this subspecies the name "*Ac. f. capitatus*"; he also used the same name (as "subsp. nov.") in the legend for Figs 1–4. In the following paper (Kusnetzov-Ugamsky, 1929) he used for the same Far Eastern form of *L. fuliginosus* the Karawajew's name "*orientalis*". Formally, the name "*capitatus*" could be considered as an unnecessarily proposed replacement name for var. *orientalis*, but in fact, *L. orientalis* is another species, that differs both from "oriental *fuliginosus*" and from *capitatus* (see below).

For many years the taxonomic status of the subspecies *capitatus* was enigmatic, until Wilson (1955) designated the lectotype of this form and considered it as a junior synonym of *L. fuliginosus* with such comments: "[the lectotype]*...Possessing a shallow occipital emargination and short petiolar hairs, both of which characters seem to predominate in north-eastern Asia...*" (*loc. cit.*, p. 143).

On the contrary, Kupyanskaya (1989), according to Kusnetzov-Ugamsky's original description and drawings (see above) believed that the main diagnostic features of *L. capitatus* and *L. crispus* are actually the same. Hence, she revived the name *capitatus* from synonymy, raised it to species rank as senior synonym of *L. crispus* Wilson and provided some details characteristic of all of the three castes, although she considered the types of *L. capitatus* as probably lost. However, Kupyanskaya's