This is a strong paper with many merits. It offers a diachronic analysis that can allow to conclude on solid bases that in Italian causal clauses derive diachronically from manner clauses. This nicely adds to the previous knowledge that causal clauses derive from temporal clauses. The diachronic analysis is very detailed, the paper is well-written and, as far as I can judge, it takes into consideration all the recent approaches to adverbial clauses in the generative literature and builds over them. The analysis of *siccome* clauses in current Italian builds on a clear intuition and it makes sense at the light of the diachronic pattern that is described. All in all, it seems to me that the paper should be published modulo some clarifications, that I outline below.

General comment:

My main concern with the present paper is that I do not fully understand how the proposed analysis for Italian *siccome* clauses fits with Arsenijević's (2021) general account of causal clauses, which the Author endorses.

Arsenijević explicitly claims that "the prediction of the present analysis on which the subordinate clause is asserted is that the hierarchical structure does not play a role in the derivation of the interpretation intuitively identified as causality" and reinforces this point by arguing that "in (17a) *[his numeration]* the semantics is as in the proposed analysis of causal clauses". Concretely, Arsenijević claims that in both 17a and 3d *[his numeration]* the causal meaning is determined pragmatically: there is a presupposition that (John's) having a deadline implies (him) staying late. This despite the fact that the two sentences have a different syntax (coordination in 17a as opposed to subordination in 3d).

17a. John has a deadline and he stays late.

3d. John stays late because he has a deadline.

So, causation is not determined syntactically in Arsenijević's account. However, in the paper a syntactic analysis of Italian *siccome*-clauses is proposed. In particular, it is argued that *siccome* clauses emerged in Modern Italian around mid-18th century when the *wh*-phrase started being externally merged in the left periphery rather than being moved there from the vP/TP area, as it was the case in older Italian. According to the Author, it is this change in the syntactic derivation that caused a set of consequences and led to the present day Italian.

A related point is that Arsenijević claims that causal clauses are non-restrictive relatives unlike other adverbial clauses (say conditional) that are restrictive. This difference between restrictive and non-restrictive should be integrated in the analysis, if the Author decides to stick to Arsenijević's account.

Pg. 6:

I had problems following the summary of Arsenijević's account offered here. In particular, I was puzzled reading the paraphrase in (6) , since (6) establishes that there is a correlation between John's being late and John's having a deadline but of course correlation is not causation and the sentence 'John stays late because he has a deadline' establishes a causation, not a simple correlation. The point is clarified later when it is argued that the similarity in manner between the events in the two clauses is enriched by the implicature that correlation between events taking place in the same manner involves a causal relation. I suggest that the role of the implicature be introduced when the paraphrase in (6) is given.

Pg. 9:

I understand that this paper focuses on siccome causal clausal and not on causal clauses in general, notably those that derive from temporal expressions like poiché (much like English 'since'). Still I would like the Author to tell us whether they think that the analysis for *siccome* can extend to other causal clauses or not.

Pg. 10:

"Throughout the history of Italian *siccome/sì come* expresses both complement and adverbial relations"

Can the Author give an example of *siccome* introducing a complement?

Pg. 22:

What is a "C0 head"? Maybe this should be a C^0 head?

Pg. 26:

I understand that the Merge-over-Move Principle nicely explains the diachronic change leading to Modern Italian (*siccome* being merged in the CP area instead of being moved there). Still, I have to notice that status of Merge-over-Move has becomes quite problematic in most recent minimalistic theorizing. For example Chomsky (2019: UCLA lectures) argues that whne possible Move (Internal Merge) is favored as it is requires investigating a smaller domain (the portion of the sentence built up to a given moment X) than External Merge does (External Merge in fact requires exploring the entire lexicon, namely thousands of items). The controversial status of Merge-over-Move should be mentioned.