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**Abstract.** – *Tychius colossus* n. sp. from central Turkey is here described. Its habitus and type of vestiture keep it apart from other known species of the genus. It is thus temporarily included into the *T. intrusus* group near the quite similar *T. trivialis* Boheman, 1843, and *T. longiclava* Hustache, 1937.

**Résumé.** – Description d’un nouveau *Tychius* de Turquie (Coleoptera, Curculionidae, Curculioninae). *Tychius colossus* n. sp., du centre de la Turquie, est décrit. En raison de son habitus et de son type de squamation, il n’y a actuellement aucune espèce connue strictement apparentée au sein du genre. Ce taxon est donc placé temporairement dans le groupe de *T. intrusus* près des espèces semblables *T. trivialis* Boheman, 1843, et *T. longiclava* Hustache, 1937.
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Recently, we had the opportunity to study a small series of a large sized species of *Tychius* Germar, 1817 (Coleoptera, Curculionidae, Curculioninae, Tychiini) collected in Turkey. After a careful comparison of these specimens with other known species in the genus, we realized that they belong to a new taxon. The aim of the present paper is its description and an attempt to find the morphologically most closely related species in the genus.

*Tychius* (*Tychius*) *colossus* n. sp.

http://zoobank.org/7DF8AB55-2596-47B2-B2CD-AF4903D3EBA9


**Paratypes**: 4 ♂, 5 ♀, same data as the holotype (coll. Caldara, Ringenbach and Weill); 1 ♀, Turkey, Kosutdere, 39°56'N - 37°24'E, Hafik, Sivas Prov., 1380 m, 22.V.2015, J. C. Ringenbach leg. (coll. Ringenbach).

**Description of the holotype.** – Fig 1. Length 4.9 mm (rostrum excluded). Body robust, oval; integument except rostrum from antennal insertion, antennae and tarsi, completely hidden by recumbent, very dense, elongate subelliptical, yellowish light brown scales (length/width 4-7), slightly paler along midline and sides of pronotum and elytra, uniformly arranged on elytra where striae are indistinguishable from interstriae.

**Head.** Rostrum black with reddish apex, long (rostrum length/rostrum width 7.0; rostrum length/pronotum length 1.10), in lateral view straight, of same width from base to antennal insertion then gradually tapered to apex (fig. 3), in dorsal view of same width from base to apex, distinctly striate-punctate to near apex. Head between eyes slightly wider than rostrum at base. Eyes slightly convex. Antennae reddish, with funicle of seven segments, with first segment about 2× as long as wide, nearly as robust as and 1.5× longer than second segment, segment 2-7 a little longer than wide, club elongate oval.

**Pronotum.** Dark brown, with dense and regular punctures, transverse (width/length 1.28), with moderately rounded sides, widest on basal half, moderately convex.

**Elytra.** Blackish brown, oval, moderately elongate (length/width 1.29), 1.35× wider than pronotum, with weakly rounded sides, widest on basal half, convex; striae covered with a row of scales.
Legs. Profemora with indistinct fringe of scales and without tooth, meso- and metafemora with robust tooth with blunt apex; protibiae without tooth along inner margin; tarsi reddish, with first segment 1.3x as long as wide, second segment transverse, third one distinctly wider than second and bilobed, claws with processes separated and as long as two thirds of claw.

Paratypes. – Length 4.8-6.0 mm (rostrum excluded). Female (fig. 2) as male except rostrum very long (rostrum length/rostrum width 9-9.5; rostrum length/pronotum length 1.30-1.40) (fig. 4), more shining and less punctured on apical half, in lateral view weakly curved on apical half. Spermatheca and spiculum ventrale as in fig. 7-8. Apart from sexual characters there are no significant differences between all paratypes and holotype.

Etymology. – The name of this species, a Latin masculine substantive signifying “giant”, aims to highlight that it is one of the largest species of the genus.

Fig. 1-4. – Tychius colossus n. sp., habitus. – 1-2. Dorsal view: 1, ♂ holotype; 2, ♀. – 3-4. Lateral view: 3, ♂ holotype; 4, ♀.
Distribution. – Central Turkey.

Remarks. – The general habitus and the exceptionally large size, approaches at first sight this species to member of the *T. gigas* group as defined by Caldara (1990), which includes almost all the largest species of *Tychius*. However a more detailed examination, including the study of the genitalia, makes its placement in the genus very puzzling. In fact, *T. colossus* differs from all the species of the *T. gigas* group by the scales of its dorsal vestiture, which are all elongate elliptical and not partly broadly lanceolate on sides of pronotum and on elytral interstriae, and by the shape of the penis which lacks the two curious lateral tips at its apex (fig. 5-6). Moreover, none of the species of the *T. gigas* group has such a long and straight rostrum, especially the female one, and eyes almost flat. The penis is similar to that of several species of the *T. intrusus* group which live on Fabaceae Astragaleae (Caldara, 1990), although we have unfortunately no information on the host plant of *T. colossus* since all type specimens were collected by beating herbaceous plants that do not belong to Fabaceae. Among the species of the *T. intrusus* group, the vestiture of *T. colossus* (disposition, shape and colour of scales) is similar to that of both *T. trivialis* Boheman, 1843, which is widely distributed from central and eastern Europe to Siberia, and of *T. longiclava* Hustache, 1937, endemic of south-eastern France (Caldara, 2013), near which we temporarily place our new species. *T. longiclava* is similar to *T. colossus* also in the shape and the very elongate rostrum of the female. Apart from the smaller size (2.7-3.3 mm), however, this species also differs clearly from *T. colossus* by the shape of its genitalia.
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