

Preface

Marie-Henriette Gates^a

^a *Bilkent University*

Medieval glazed wares were the most visible archaeological remains on the top and slopes of the mound at Kinet Höyük when a Bilkent University team first visited the site during a brief survey in August 1991. Their numbers dominated other occupational periods almost to exclusion, not least because they were immediately recognizable in contrast to most of the other ceramics we were collecting. The student team members were for the most part new to archaeological fieldwork, and felt rewarded by these colorful sherds, which they could easily identify. Further survey of the fields to the north and east of the mound, and to its west as far as the shoreline produced more medieval pottery, in frequencies far outstripping earlier (or later) periods. They conveyed the impression that medieval Kinet formed an urban center of some size, with a citadel mound overlooking extensive residential quarters and harbor facilities at sea level.

Kinet had admittedly, long before 1991, acquired a historical attribution among medieval scholars as the port Hisn al-Tinat, which shipped cargo such as timber for a busy commercial network around the eastern Mediterranean. In response to this possibility, the geomorphologist accompanying our survey was able to distinguish a relic riverbed flowing along the mound's south skirt into the sea. Its estuary would have provided a harbor for Kinet in medieval times, according to surface finds, before the river moved south several kilometers to its present course. The survey indeed seemed to support the site's affiliation with medieval history more visibly than with its other historical attribution, for the classical period. An unbroken tradition since antiquity had designated the plain around Kinet as the location for Alexander the Great's battle of 333 BCE at Issos; the prominent town and harbor of this name were thus presumed to be Kinet Höyük since at least the 19th century. Our survey did collect some Hellenistic sherds, but hardly any earlier pottery, notably the Persian and Late Iron Age varieties that were needed to make a convincing case for Issos. Nor did this attribution appeal to local authorities or contemporary lore, which (still) incorrectly signposts Issos at the impressive classical site of Gözeneler (ancient *Epiphaneia*), 30 km inland to the north, near Erzin.

Another supposition from the survey concerned the character of Kinet's medieval phase, which we initially perceived as no more than the final step in a long and continuous occupational process. We assumed its material features to be typical of the entire region, without any particular distinction, and saw the medieval episode emerging as the next inevitable moment in the site's cultural history. Here again, the survey's findings about this last phase of habitation at Kinet gave us no insight on the circumstances that led to its establishment and purpose.

The excavations following upon the survey, from 1992-2011, overturned all of these assumptions. Kinet's medieval settlement was in fact limited to the mound itself, where stratified remains were recovered on the summit of the mound immediately below its surface, and on terraces against its eastern skirt. All medieval ceramics on surfaces in the periphery had washed down from the mound, as determined by soundings in the fields to its north and east (1999-2002, 2005), and between the mound and the sea (2011). Medieval sherds were also found to have been displaced and redeposited in the surrounding – and sometimes distant – fields during the construction of commercial shipping companies at the site in the 1980s. Moreover, we soon acknowledged that the medieval settlement was founded on a long-abandoned site, chosen for its high elevation, but without any claim to its previous cultural identities. Proximity to the sea also seemed a less relevant factor, since the estuary harbor had by then silted in, although ships could be accommodated nearby. Instead of prolonging a long-established continuum of existence, the medieval town was eventually understood to represent a new event, orchestrated by foreigners armed with an ambitious program to re-appropriate the site and the region for themselves.

Early in the project, Scott Redford joined as associate director for medieval research to oversee its fieldwork and provide a comprehensive assessment of this last development in the occupational history of pre-modern Kinet. We had worked together at Gritille, a salvage excavation (1981-1984) on the Euphrates in Adıyaman province. Site survey there had proposed that the site was in large part prehistoric; but the first excavation season revealed that a minimal prehistoric core was embedded in a primarily medieval occupation, for which Scott was given full responsibility. In comparison to Kinet, Gritille presented the inverse situation in terms of relative impact of site phasing: the prominence of its medieval phase outweighed the earlier ones. The common thread connecting the two sites, however, was their association with European Crusaders of the northern Levant, in their Frankish states at Urfa (Edessa) and Samosata for Gritille, and at Antakya (Antioch) for Kinet.

As the Kinet excavations make clear, its location repeatedly attracted outsiders intent on entering the Mediterranean's maritime network, from early times to the present. Kinet's Templars were preceded, in person or in an administrative capacity, by e.g. Hittites, Assyrians and Achaemenid Persians. Their contemporary successors, financing the oil and gas terminals, have been Emirati-, British-, Russian- and French-owned corporations. The Crusader episode thus fits into a recurring pattern that ensured the economic

survival of this small but lucrative site. Given its wide-ranging and multicultural character, Scott Redford was the historical archaeologist of the medieval Near East whose scholarship and expertise best suited Kinet's final excavated phase. The Kinet Höyük project was indeed fortunate to secure his collaboration, concluding with this Medieval volume in the series of *Bilkent University Excavations at Kinet Höyük (Hatay): Final Reports*.

Kinet Phases VI-I: an overview of the excavation's findings

The site of Kinet Höyük (Dörtöyl-Hatay), on the shores of İskenderun Bay at the eastern limit of ancient Cilicia, was selected in 1991 as a Bilkent University excavation project to determine the economic strategies and resilience of a small Mediterranean seaport over a long duration, from antiquity to the present. Its program was launched in the stimulating context of renewed archaeological research in the region, interrupted since the early 20th century's seminal work at the large sites of Mersin-Yumuktepe, Sirkeli, and especially Tarsus. Among the current new projects, Kinet represents the only small, long-lived site and seaport to be investigated on the Turkish Mediterranean coast. It has proved successful in fulfilling its initial research promise and aims, presented in the following synopsis in order to situate the Medieval (Phase 1) settlement within the site's broader occupational perspective.¹

Kinet's stratigraphic sequence and occupational history were tested during the first field season (1992) by three step trenches on the mound's steep east, north and west slopes. The most instructive was West Slope sounding C, facing the sea, and eventually extended to the current base of the mound. It resulted in Kinet's chronological framework of six major cultural phases divided into 29 periods (stratigraphic levels). All six phases illustrate the defining features that distinguish seaports from inland sites: the pairing of small settlement size with large-scale architecture; an economy based on the transfer of goods rather than subsistence and production; and the unexpected involvement of prominent political centers in the management of otherwise insignificant places. From at least the second millennium BCE onwards, the seaport alternated between autonomous regional prosperity lasting several centuries, and the intrusive presence of an enterprising state.

Bronze Age Kinet: Phases VI-IV (ca. 2800-1150 BCE)

Early Bronze Phase VI (5.50-12.50 masl) in the West Slope's Area M provided the fullest stratigraphic sequence and exposure for Kinet in the third millennium BCE. This phase was also recovered in stratified EB deposits

on the mound's northeast flank, and in field soundings to the north, for a maximum settlement extent of 5 ha. In EB II (Phase VI.4, Periods 29-25), the earliest excavated levels, a fortified citadel already enclosed an elevated residential district; below it, along the shoreline, were port installations and housing. Their ceramics and other finds situate the site's cultural affiliations in Cilicia and the northeastern valleys crossing the Amanus range.

Changes in EB III (Phase VI.3-2, Periods 24-22) expanded the site's horizons and its material culture into the Amuq and western Syria. Some form of central management was assumed by a large building with courtyards, sunken storage containers, and record-keeping (seals). Cuneiform texts from Tell Mardikh, ancient *Ebla*, suggest that the EB III seaport joined greater Cilicia in a commercial partnership with that royal city. Kinet's identification with ancient *Ama*, a seaport supplying the west Syrian kingdom with fish sauce and timber, is plausible (Steinkeller 2021, 2023). Grapes (and their byproducts) were another of EB Kinet's commercial resources, according to their high percentages in the Phase VI botanical sample. This prosperous period throughout the Levant ended in several centuries of retrenchment, reflected at Kinet (Phase VI.1, Periods 21-19) by untidy housing, recycled materials, and the disappearance of cash crops such as fruit. Trading continued, but occupation diminished and eventually ceased.

For the final report on Phase VI, see C. Eslick, *Kinet Höyük 2. The Early Bronze Age and Earlier Occupations* (2024). This volume also presents Late Neolithic and Chalcolithic residual finds from the prehistoric version of the site, probably located to the southwest of the mound on the early banks of the estuary.

Middle Bronze Phase V (12.50-15.00 masl) was refounded in MB I (Phase V.2, Period 18), after a brief interval, on the final EB level's eroded surfaces. This period and its two MB II successors (Phase V.1, Periods 17-16), spanning the first half of the second millennium BCE, were recovered on the west and east slopes of the mound, a surface area of 3.3ha. No MB deposits occurred in any of the field soundings, a sign that a higher sea level extended this period's shoreline to the foot of the mound (Al Maqdissi et al. 2007). The MB occupation was thus confined to an elevated settlement, 12.5m and higher above the harbor.

Phase V is best understood from the East Terrace's Area K, where a monumental Period 16 building, thoroughly burnt in an earthquake with furnishings in situ, lay readily accessible under shallow Medieval and Hellenistic levels. The excavated sector, ca. 50m long and 365m², exposed the northeast corner of an imposing orthogonal structure, set like a fortress on the high inland edge of the MB mound. Its formal plan recalls contemporary defensive architecture in the Levant, on Cyprus and in Egypt (Peltenburg 2008; Gates 2019), and may represent the mound's principal or single structure in Period 16. Soundings underneath the

¹ Site summaries of similar format and wording will accompany each preface in the Kinet Höyük Final Reports Series (e.g. *Kinet 2*, 2024: viii-x). Preliminary reports for the 1991 survey and 1992 – 2011 excavation seasons are published in *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* [KST] and *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* [AST], available online at <https://kvmgm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-44758/yayinlarimiz.html>.

floors exposed an earlier building (Period 17), its burnt walls in the same alignment, again collapsed by earthquake with burnt contents.

All three periods of Phase V's material culture, including its painted pottery, link MB Kinet to its Cilician roots and to northwest Syria. It was also connected by intensive maritime commerce to the wider reaches of the coastal Levant and Cyprus, where many small seaports like Kinet engaged actively in shipping. The distribution of standard MB jar types, designed for transport by boat, provides a tangible record for the routes of these exchanges, and for Kinet's participation in them. Finally, its massive architectural compound draws parallels to fortress-palaces on various scales throughout the eastern Mediterranean; and places the site in a cosmopolitan context, either as an autonomous agent, or on behalf of an inland regional center such as Zincirli.

Late Bronze Phase IV (15.00-17.00 masl) marked a complete break from Syro-Cilician material culture. Its architecture, ceramics and other household goods instead replicated a Central Anatolian assemblage associated with the Hittite state, from its formation in the Old Kingdom to the end of its empire four centuries later (ca. 1540-1150 BCE). This period corresponds to the Hittite state's historical involvement with a Cilician kingdom designated by the name Kizzuwatna. Imported Cypriot pottery at Kinet dates the start of this phase shortly after the demise of Phase V (Gates 2006).

Four Hittite-affiliated periods were exposed over seven seasons and ca. 280 m² on the mound's West Slope in Area J/L+ E/H. This elevated sector, facing the sea, was occupied in LB I (Phase IV.2, Period 15) by large-scale architecture of Hittite inspiration and building techniques. Some time after its abandonment, a second large complex was built on a different plan in LB II (IV.1.1, Period 14). The West Slope's status then shifted from official structures to residential ones with courtyards in later LB II (IV.1.1, Period 13.1); and ended in untidy housing and evident impoverishment in sub-Hittite LB III (IV.1.2, Period 13.2). Below this upper city, a lower town extended around the Late Bronze harbor, according to Phase IV levels in the north field soundings R and Area Z. Both LB II levels (14 and 13.1) were destroyed by fire, perhaps fueled by hostilities. The LB III (13.2) settlement was brought down by earthquake.

Late Bronze Kinet's identification with the Hittite coastal town *Izziya* has been proposed on the basis of reasonable circumstantial arguments (Forlanini 2001, Gates 2013). Seal impressions and hieroglyphic potmarks referring to "royal property" and "palace" suggest an official Hittite investment at Kinet, certainly because of the access it provided to eastern Mediterranean shipping. Cypriot imports and Levantine transport jars bear witness to an active participation in the maritime trade network, uninterrupted since Middle Bronze II but now under a different geopolitical aegis.

Iron Age Kinet: Phase III (ca. 1150-330/300 BCE)

Like other sites in the northeastern Mediterranean, the seaport at Kinet underwent profound cultural changes over the course of the Iron Age. It nonetheless maintained its resilience, and functioned without pause throughout its nine centuries and nine levels (Periods 12-3B, 17.00-23.00 masl), reflecting current commercial trends, and occasionally attracting the direct interest of the external political forces behind them (e.g. Assyrian, Babylonian, Achaemenid Persian). This long-term cycle, already observed in the second millennium, appears to have promoted the longevity of the site. Phase III was excavated on the west and east slopes (Areas L+E/H, A/D), on the upper north side (Area G), and in the south slope's deep sounding U. Middle Iron Age occupation (Phase III.2) was recovered in the north field soundings Z and the east terrace soundings K4-K9; and a Persian level (Phase III.1) in soundings (2011) on the BP terminal property, between the mound and the sea.

After a long *Early Iron Phase III.3* (Period 12) characterized by thick trash layers and pits, no architecture, and a heterogeneous 11th-century ceramic assemblage of local and imported styles, Kinet was swept up by the revived commercial ferment of the Middle Iron Age Mediterranean. *Middle Iron Phase III.2's* ceramic affiliations were closely tied to Cypriot fashion in Periods 11-10, and best illustrated in Period 9, whose imposing structures and their burnt contents were well preserved. They included Geometric pottery imported from the Aegean (Gimatidis et al. 2023). Period 8 (late eighth century) interrupted this regional fashion and its maritime connections by implanting a formal Assyrian presence, identified by a distinctive material culture, masonry styles, cylinder seals and horses, but no interest in the sea. A destruction in the seventh century BCE marks the end of this eventful Middle Iron Age phase.

Late Iron Phase III.1 followed the same alternating pattern of regional network versus larger sphere of influence, now reformulated by different agents. The cultural features of Periods 7-6 reflected a commercial network dominated by the products of the eastern Aegean and their styles, popularized throughout the Levant by many economic partners, including Phoenician traders. This regional autonomy was overturned by Achaemenid control in Cilicia during the fifth and fourth centuries, and at Kinet by the construction of a garrison and fortifications (Periods 5-3B). In this case, however, connections with the wider Mediterranean continued as before, attested among other features by transport amphorae from near and distant sources. Destructions put an end to Periods 7 and 6. In contrast, the stratigraphic changes for Persian Periods 5, 4 and 3B involved a rearrangement of buildings and structural levels, rather than replacement after suffering damage. The 3B fortress survived into the early Hellenistic period without break. This continuity would agree with historical accounts that *Issos*, ancient Kinet, survived untouched by the conflicts between the Greek and Persian forces.

Hellenistic Kinet: Phase II (ca. 330/300-90/75 BCE)

Hellenistic Phase II (23.00-24.50 masl), the last of Kinet's ancient settlements, began by modifying the fourth-century Persian garrison, and adopting the eastern Mediterranean's cultural homogeneity in early Hellenistic pottery styles and imports (Period 3A, third to mid-second centuries BCE). The site was refounded as Period 2 (ca. 150 BCE) on a grid plan extending over the Persian enclosure walls, and its houses for the first time were roofed with tiles. Earthquake put an end to this brief occupation early in the first century BCE. The formality of Period 2's layout and buildings suggests yet another episode of official presence exploiting this seaport's advantages. Its harbors were by this point silting up, however, and Kinet was abandoned for the next millennium.

The only traces of the Roman and Late Antique periods were a paved road running parallel to the coastline 100m inland from the mound (northeast field soundings T1-3); and the biceps of a monumental male statue in marble, salvaged for lime from a Roman imperial site in the vicinity, and recovered at Kinet beside a medieval furnace (OP. G, 2005).

Medieval Kinet: Phase I (12th-14th c. AD/CE)

Medieval Phase I (Period 1, with 4 subphases, 23.50-25.00 masl) saw the revival of Kinet when Crusaders were based in Antioch, and settled here for over a century. Housing was restricted to the top of the mound and terraces on its east slope, away from the seaside. The high mound may have found favor because of its protective elevation above the plain, as happened elsewhere in medieval Anatolia, when populations retreated from low-lying sites during these troubled times to reclaim abandoned mounds. This shift in settlement pattern is also suggested by the earlier medieval "Tüpraş Field site" (8th/9th – 12th c.) on the seashore 900m to the north, which fell vacant when Kinet was resettled (Eger 2010). After its final destruction, the Kinet mound and its environs stayed unoccupied until 1986, when the Delta Petroleum Company once again realized this location's benefits for shipping cargo by sea.

Acknowledgments

The Kinet Höyük excavations (1992-2012) were carried out with the institutional backing of Bilkent University (Ankara, TR), and approval from the T.C. Ministry of Culture's General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums (permit no. 1993/4430). We remain deeply grateful for the confidence they expressed in the Kinet project during its two decades of fieldwork at the site; and during a third decade of research (2012-2022), when a large study collection from the excavations was stored in facilities on the Bilkent campus, with permission from the Ministry. The study collection was returned to the Hatay Müzesi (Antakya) in April 2022; since August 2023, it is permanently housed in the Hatay archaeological research center at Tell Atchana (<https://www.alalakh.org/research-center/>).

Finds selected for museum inventory were registered at the end of each campaign, accounting by 2012, the last fieldwork season, for a total of 2,213 items.

Ministry representatives for the seasons discussed in this final report merit our warmest thanks for their guidance and help: Ömer Faruk Türkân (1993-1994, Silifke/Akşehir Müzeleri); Bekir Altan (1995, Hatay Müzesi); Alişan Işık (1996, Side Müzesi); İlhan Ünlüsoy (1997, Antalya Müzesi); Azize Yener (1998, Antalya Müzesi); Naci Bakırcı (1999, Konya Müzesi), Mustafa Ergün (1999, Silifke Müzesi); Akif Gaffaroğlu (2000, Alanya Müzesi), Fulya Sönmez (2000, Anıtlar ve Müzeler G.M.); Ömer Çelik (2001, Hatay Müzesi); Ali Dervişağaoğlu (2002, Fethiye Müzesi); Taner Aksoy (2003, Kocaeli Müzesi); Sema Dayan (2004, Ankara General Directorate); Mustafa Akaslan (2005, Isparta Müzesi). They served as valued members of the project team, and contributed fully to the successful outcome of these seasons.

Research on Kinet's Medieval settlement was financially supported by generous sponsors: The Tarbell Family Foundation (1997-2007); The Max van Berchem Foundation (2004); The Barakat Trust (2002-2003); British Petroleum -Turkey (2005-2011); Georgetown University (1996-2005); and Bilkent University foremost (1992-2022). It is a pleasure to convey our considerable obligation and thanks to them in the context of this final report publication. Other benefactors are mentioned in the editor's acknowledgments in this volume

Bibliography:

- Al Maqdissi et al. 2007 = Al Maqdissi, M; Bretschneider, J.; Degryse, P.; Hameeuw, H.; Kaniewski, D.; Paulissen, E.; Van Simaey, S.; and Van Lerberghe, K.
- 2007 Environmental Changes in the Jebel Plain (Syria). Geophysical, Geomorphological, Palynological, Archaeological and Historical Research. *Res Antiquae* 4: 3–10.
- Eger 2010 = Eger, A.
- 2010 Hişn al-Tināt on the Islamic-Byzantine Frontier: Synthesis and the 2005-2008 Survey and Excavation on the Cilician Plain (Turkey). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 357: 49–76.
- Forlanini 2001 = Forlanini, M.
- 2001 Quelques notes sur la géographie historique de la Cilicie. Pp. 553-563 in É. Jean et al. (eds), *La Cilicie: Espaces et pouvoirs locaux* (2^e millénaire av. J.C.–4^e siècle ap. J.-C.) (Varia Anatolica 13). Paris: De Boccard.
- Gates 2006 = Gates, M.-H.
- 2006 Dating the Hittite Levels at Kinet Höyük: a Revised Chronology. Pp. 293-309 in D.P. Mielke, U.-D. Schoop, J. Seeher (eds.), *Structuring and Dating in Hittite Archaeology* [BYZAS 4]. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları.
- Gates 2013 = Gates, M.-H.

2013 The Hittite Seaport *Izziya* at Late Bronze Kinet Höyük (Cilicia), *Near Eastern Archaeology* 76(4), 223–234.

Gates 2019 = Gates, M.-H.

2019 Doing Business Bridging Gaps on Cyprus in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Pp. 257 – 277 in V. Şahoğlu, M. Şevketoğlu, Y. Erbil (eds), *Kültürlerin Bağlantısı. Başlangıçtan Roma Dönemi Sonuna Kadar Eski Yakın Doğuda Ticaret ve Bölgelerarası İlişkiler/Connecting Cultures: Trade and Interconnections in the Ancient Near East from the Beginning until the End of the Roman Period* [Anadolu/Anatolia Supplement Series I.4]. Ankara: AÜ-DTCF.

Gimatizidis et al. 2023 = Gimatizidis, S., Gates, M.-H., Lehmann, G.

2023 Aegean and Aegeanising Geometric Pottery at Kinet Höyük: New Patterns of Greek Pottery Production, Exchange and Consumption in the Mediterranean. *Anatolian Studies* 73: 25-68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154623000030>

Peltenburg 2008 = Peltenburg, E.

2008 Nitovikla and Tell el-Burak: Cypriot Mid-Second Millennium BC Forts in a Levantine Context. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus* 2008: 145–158.

Steinkeller 2021 = Steinkeller, P.

2021 International Trade in Greater Mesopotamia during Late Pre-Sargonic Times. The Case of Ebla as Illustrated by her Participation in the Euphratean Timber Trade. Pp. 173-197 in L. Rahmstorf et al. (eds), *Merchants, Measures and Money. Understanding Technologies of Early Trade in a Comparative Perspective*. Kiel: Wachholtz Verlag.

Steinkeller 2023 = Steinkeller, P.

2023 Online lecture (28.03.2023): “Ebla’s Commerce with Armi and Kablul and its Importance for History and Geography.” Columbia University Seminar on the Ancient Near East.

Kinet Höyük Orta Çağ Kazıları

Özet

Hatay Dört Yol ilçesi, Yeşil mahallesindeki Kinet Höyük kazıları 1992 ile 2012 arasında Prof. Dr. Marie-Henriette Gates başkanlığındaki Bilkent Üniversitesi ekibi tarafından sürdürülmüştür. Bu kitap, çok evreli höyüğün en üst katmanında, 12. yüzyılın ortasından 14. yüzyılın ilk çeyreğine kadar süren Orta Çağ yerleşmesinin kazı sonuçlarını ve malzeme analizlerini konu etmektedir.

Kinet Höyük (Arapça al-Tinat [İncirlik], İtalyanca ve Latince Canamella [Şeker Kamışlığı]), gerek Orta Çağ Arap kaynaklarında gerekse Haçlı dönemi Batı Avrupa kaynaklarında Amanos dağlarından indirilen ve İskenderun körfezine gelen gemilere yüklenen kereste ticaretiyle uğrasan küçük bir liman olarak tanıtılır. Aynı zamanda, Orta Çağda halâ faaliyette olan Roma dönemi Antakya-Çukurova yolu üstünde bulunması, deniz ticaretiyle beraber karada da ticarî ve askerî açıdan önemli bir merkez olmasını sağlamıştır.

Kinet Höyük'ün Orta Çağ yerleşmesi dört ana tabakadan oluşur. Dört tabakada da savunma yapılarında ve konutlarda aynı inşaat malzemeleri ve mimari formlar kullanılmıştır. Dere taşı ya da daha erken tabakalardan toplanan devşirme taşlar kullanılarak duvar temelleri atılmıştır, bu taş temellerin üstüne kerpiç duvar yükselir. Ahşap direk destekli binaların tavanları saz, çalı-çırpı ve çamur ile kaplıdır. Bazı avlularda benzer örtü malzemeleri kullanılarak ahşap direkler üstünde gölgeli çalışma alanları da oluşturulmuştur.

Bu dört tabakanın üçü yangın ve talanla sona ermiştir. Sadece en erkeni olan birinci yerleşme, bugün bilemediğimiz sebeplerle, herhangi bir felaket yaşanmadan sona ermiştir. Seramik buluntuları, demir işliği de bulunan bu ilk Orta Çağ tabakasını 12. yüzyılın ortasına tarihlenmemizi mümkün kılar.

İkinci tabakada höyük sur duvarıyla çevrilmiştir. Sur içi yerleşme alanları surdan başlayarak höyüğün ortasına doğru uzanan, tekerlek parmaklığı şeklinde uzun duvarlarla bölünmüştür. Sur içi muhtemelen bir garnizonu barındırıyordu. 12. yüzyılın son çeyreğine tarihlenen bu ikinci evre, yangınla son bulmuştur. Bu evrede Antakya Haçlı Devleti sikkelerinin yoğun olduğu bir define bulunmuştur. 12. yüzyılda Kinet'in bulunduğu bölge Antakya Haçlı Devleti ile Ermeni Baronluğu'nun egemenliğindeki Çukurova arasındaydı. Tarih metinlerine göre bu sınır bölgesi Haçlı Tapınak Şövalyeleri'nin kontrolü altındaydı. Kinet'te her ne kadar Batı Avrupa'dan gelen objelere rastlanmasa da büyük olasılıkla bu evrede Kinet'te Tapınak Şövalyeleri ile bağlantılı yerli Hristiyanlar yaşamaktaydı ve yerleşmenin yağmalanması, bölgede faaliyet gösteren Hristiyan güçlerin çekişmelerinden kaynaklanmaktaydı.

Üçüncü tabakada ikinci evrenin yapı temelleri yeniden kullanılmıştır, ancak hem sur duvarı hem de sur içindeki yapıların çoğu daha özensizce yeniden inşa edilmiştir. Höyüğün doğu eteklerinde de evler inşa edilmiş, sırlı seramik ve demir atölyeleri kurulmuştur. Bu tabaka 13. yüzyılın başlarına, Kilikya Ermeni Krallığı'nın kuruluş dönemine tarihlenebilir. Bu devletin bastığı paralarla beraber, bazı sırlı ve sırsız seramikler üzerine çizilmiş Ermenice harfler tespit edilmiştir. Bu üçüncü tabaka, Memluk kaynaklarında bahsi geçen 1266'taki Memluk saldırısında yakılmıştır.

Dördüncü tabaka yerleşiminde, bir önceki tabakanın demir ve seramik üretimleri sürdürülürken, höyüğün askeri işlevine son verilmiştir. Dördüncü tabakanın kalıntıları yüzeye çok yakın olduğu için çift sürerken tahrip edilmiştir. Bir önceki evrelere göre bu son Orta Çağ iskânı daha çok bir köy mahiyetindedir. Yapılar daha düzensizdir ve binaların arasında boşluklar vardır. Ayrıca, bu tabaka halkı ölümlerini höyüğün üstüne gömmüşlerdi. Bu dördüncü Orta Çağ evresinin 14. yüzyılın birinci çeyreğinde sona erdiği tabakada bulunan Ermeni Krallığı'na ait paralardan anlaşılmaktadır.

Kaynaklarda Kinet'teki Orta Çağ yerleşmesi kereste (çam ve meşe) ticaretiyle özdeşleştirilmektedir. Ancak bölgenin rutubetli iklimi toprakta ahşap gibi organik malzemelerin izini yok etmiştir. O halde, Kinet sakinleri hayatlarını başka yöntemlerle mi kazanmışlardı? Daha önce belirtildiği gibi, Kinet Höyük'te sırlı seramik üretimi vardı. Ürünler, "Port Saint Symeon/el-Mina" denilen kil hamurlu üç renk sırlı sgraffito seramik grubuna girer. Seramik kâseler yanında yine aynı malzeme ve aynı teknikle yapılmış çiniler de üretilmiştir. Son yıllarda benzer kâse ve çini üretimi Misis/Yakapınar ve Mersin Yumuktepe kazılarında da tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca, demir üretimi vardı.

Bu kitapta Orta Çağ'da Kinet'teki sırlı seramik üretimi Yona Waksman ve Jacques Burlot, demir obje üretimi ise Ümit Güder tarafından incelenmektedir. Amanda Phillips, kumaş üretimiyle ilgili ipuçlarını değerlendirmiştir. Tohum analizi yapan Marijke van der Veen ile Alastair Hill, buğday, arpa, mercimek gibi olağan tarım ürünleriyle birlikte susam, keten, pamuk ve pirinç tohumlarını de tespit ettiler. Canan Çakırlar ile Salima İkrâm, hayvan kemik analizlerini yürüttüler. Bulguları, keçi ve koyun sürülerinin et veya süttten çok yün için kullanıldığını göstermektedir. Kinet sakinleri, hayvansal proteinlerini daha çok domuz ve sığır etinden sağlamış, Akdeniz'in neredeyse kıyısında oturdukları halde az balık yemişlerdi.