The Cairo Coptos Colossi has four inscriptions that have been discussed in connection with Narmer. They have been designated by Kahl 1994 and Regulski as 85a (Williams 1988: fig. 3a), 85b (fig. 1a), 85c (fig. 1b), and 85d (fig. 1c). Kahl 1994 and Regulski classify 85a and 85b as Narmer. 85c and 85d are classified as (Narmer). In the Narmer Catalog all four inscriptions are included in source no. 0085.

Comments
The Cairo Coptos Colossi has four inscriptions that have been discussed in connection with Narmer. They have been designated by Kahl 1994 and Regulski as 85a (Williams 1988: fig. 3a), 85b (fig. 1a), 85c (fig. 1b), and 85d (fig. 1c). Kahl 1994 and Regulski classify 85a and 85b as Narmer. 85c and 85d are classified as (Narmer). In the Narmer Catalog all four inscriptions are included in source no. 0085.

The debate over these inscriptions has primarily focused on fig 3a. and 1a. It is important to note that fig. 3a is a reconstruction, and the accuracy of fig.1a has been questioned. Dreyer (1995, pl.10c) and Kemp (2000, fig.10a) (both reproduced on this page) show the fig. 3a inscription before reconstruction. In addition to Kahl and Regulski, Williams (1988: 37), Vernus 1993, Dreyer 1995 and 1996, Yurco 1999, Rafaele 2003, and Pätznick 2009 attribute the inscription reconstructed as fig. 3a to Narmer. According to Dreyer (1995: 52), "Williams's reconstruction is very convincing". In contrast, Ciałowicz describes it as Narmer (?), Petrie 1896 describes it as a flying bird (?), and Kemp (2000: 223-226) describes it as a falcon. Inscription fig. 1a is described as a catfish – hence representing Narmer – by Williams (1988: 36) and Dreyer (1995: 52). Referring to fig. 1a-c, Kemp (2000: 226) says "The graffiti, it should be noted, offer no support to the Narmer reading. The copies Williams uses are not wholly correct and gain significance in being shown, on their own, whereas they are actually
selected from many more scratched lines which derive from subsequent attention to the surface of the statue. The drawing of the catfish-design has been given a ‘tail’ when in actuality it passes into an area where the original surface of the stone has been lost.” Baqué-Manzano 2002 discusses all of the inscriptions and is skeptical of Williams’s interpretation.