Abstract

Descriptions of mature larvae of ten species of the genus Donus Jekel, 1865 are given: larvae of D. austerus (Boheman, 1834); D. cyrtus (Germar, 1821); D. osellai Winkelmann, 2001 and D. reichei (Capiomont, 1868) are described for the first time, larvae of D. comatus (Boheman, 1842); D. oxalidis (Herbst, 1795); D. palumbarius (Germar, 1821) and D. tesselatus (Herbst, 1795) are described for the first time in detail, and larvae of D. crinitus (Boheman, 1834) and D. intermedius (Boheman, 1842) are redescribed. An identification key for the mature larvae of twenty-nine Hyperini-species known so far is presented.
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Introduction

The genus Donus Jekel, 1865 currently includes more than 115 Palaeartic species (Smreczyński 1968). The last taxonomical revision was published more than 100 years ago by Petri (1901), who divided the genus Donus into 10 groups, but using the junior synonym Hypera Capiomont, 1868 as the valid name. Zaslavskij (1959) divided the genus Donus into two genera: the mountain genus Glanis Jekel, 1864 (= Neoglanis Alonso-Zarazaga & Lyal, 1999, nomen novum for Glanis Jekel, 1864 preoccupied by Glanis Agassiz, 1857 in Pisces) and the genus Donus Jekel, 1865 with species occurring in mountains as well as in lowlands. The genus Neoglanis has been divided from the genus Donus only on the basis of vague differential characters. The taxonomic position of Neoglanis species can only be defined by detailed revision.

Alonso-Zarazaga and Lyal (2002) mentioned Pachypera Capiomont, 1868 with genus rank in the tribe Hyperini. This genus was described on the basis of the enlarged distal part and sharp inner margin of the protibia and classified also as a part of Donus by Petri (1901). The transfer of the subgenus Antidonus Bedel, 1886 from Hypera Germar, 1817 to the genus Donus (Zaslavskij 1959) leads to similar problems as previously discussed in regards to the situation concerning Neoglanis versus Donus. The revision of this genus is very necessary, as is the new evaluation of characters stated for the genus by Petri.

Descriptions of larvae of species of the genus Donus Jekel, 1865 are very scarce with few exceptions (Zaslavskij 1959, Scherf 1964, Dieckmann 1989, Nazarenko 1998, 2000a, 2000b). Some papers (Dieckmann 1989) include only descriptions of body coloration and size and lack precise data on the morphology and chaetotaxy. Descriptions of larvae by Nazarenko (1998, 2000a, 2000b) are detailed, but unfortunately he used different nomenclature for chaetotaxy in each paper. In one of his papers, Nazarenko (2000a) used a combination of two nomenclatures (Emden 1952 and Scherf 1964). Different larval nomenclature systems for