1. Introduction

1.1. Raising in generative grammar

• The analysis of raising to subject constructions has changed relatively little since the seminal work of Rosenbaum (1967)

• **Main insights** (English-type raising):
  → Raising verbs are unaccusative verbs which take a clausal complement
  → The embedded subject moves to the subject position of the matrix clause
  → The subject in (1a) must move because it cannot get Case in its original position and/or because of the EPP feature on matrix T (Chomsky 1981, 2008)
  → The embedded subject in (1b) cannot move because the PIC makes it inaccessible to operations outside the embedded CP (Chomsky 2000, 2001) and/or because nominals whose Case/phi-features have been checked cannot move (Activity Condition, Chomsky 2001)

(1) a. John seemed \[TP <John> to like Mary].
    b. It seemed \[CP that John liked Mary].

1.2. Raising in Serbo-Croatian (SC)

• I will argue that both (2a) and (2b) involve subject-to-subject raising

  **NB:** hyper-raising?

• The lack of agreement in (2b) arises because the NP raises too late for the matrix agreement probe to see it

• Failure to agree = ‘default’ agreement on the verb/participle

• In order to account for the full range of data with *trebati* ‘need’, I will argue for an analysis on which (this type of) A-movement is ‘free’

(2) a. Studentkinje su treba-l-e da peva-ju.
    students,FEM AUX.3PL need-PTCP-FEM.PL DA sing-PRES.3PL

b. Studentkinje je treba-l-o da peva-ju.
    students,FEM AUX.3SG need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA sing-PRES.3PL

‘The (female) students needed to sing’
1.3. Outline of the talk

§2 Overview of agreement in SC

§3 *Trebati* ‘need’ is a raising verb; it is an unaccusative verb that takes a clausal complement

§4 The preverbal NP with non-agreeing *trebati* ‘need’ is (also) a raised subject

§5 Analysis & discussion; a discussion of why other theories will struggle to account for the data

§6 Extending the analysis to English raising-to-subject

§7 Conclusion

2. SC Agreement

• Agreement in SC is generally not optional; transitive predicates agree with their subjects (3a) and intransitive predicates with their sole argument (3b-c)

(3) a. Marij-a i Jovan-a vid-e Milic-u.
   Marija-NOM and Jovana-NOM see-PRES.3PL Milica-ACC
   ‘Mary and Jovana see Milica’

   b. Student-i su stig-l-i.
      student-NOM.PL AUX.3PL arrive-PTCP.MASC.PL
      ‘The students have arrived’

   c. Student-i su trˇca-l-i.
      student-NOM.PL AUX.3PL run-PTCP-MASC.PL
      ‘The students have run’

• This makes the pattern in (2), now (4), exceptional; *trebati* ‘need’ can either agree with (what I will show to be) the subject as usual or not

• In fact, (4b) is the pattern observed when the verb fails to agree with a nominal argument (which has ϕ-features to transmit), as in (5)

(4) a. Studentkinje su treba-l-e da peva-ju.
    students.FEM AUX.3PL need-PTCP-FEM.PL DA sing-PRES.3PL

    b. Studentkinje je treba-l-o da peva-ju.
    students.FEM AUX.3SG need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA sing-PRES.3PL
    ‘The (female) students needed to sing’

(5) Seva-l-o je.
    flash-PTCP-NEUT.SG AUX.3SG
    ‘There was lightning’

3. *Trebati* ‘need’ as a raising verb

3.1. Bi-clausal structure

• *Trebati* ‘need’ takes a clausal complement
NPI licensing: SC i-NPIs are licensed by superordinate negation (Progovac 1991), as seen in (6)

(6) a. *I-ko ne voli i-šta.
   i-who NEG loves i-what
   intended: ‘Nobody loves anything’

   b. Marija ne tvrdi da i-ko želi i-šta.
      Mary NEG claims DA i-who wants i-what
      ‘Mary is not claiming that anybody wants anything’

   c. *Marija tvrdi da i-ko ne želi i-šta.
      Mary claims DA i-who NEG wants i-what
      intended: ‘Mary is claiming that nobody wants anything’

Trebati patterns the same as verbs like tvrditi ‘claim’ in (6b-c) that uncontroversially take a clausal complement (7)

(7) a. *Marko bi treba-o / treba-l-o da ne
    Marko AUX.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG need-LPTCP-NEUT.SG DA NEG
    uradi i-šta.
    do i-what
    intended: ‘Marko should not do anything’

   b. Marko ne bi treba-o / treba-l-o da
      Marko NEG AUX.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG need-LPTCP-NEUT.SG DA
      uradi i-šta.
      do i-what
      intended: ‘Marko should not do anything’

Conclusion: Trebati forms part of a bi-clausal structure

Restructuring? No (see Appendix)

3.2. Raising

Trebati is a raising verb (not, for example, a control verb)

Trebati and the verb in its complement may never have independent subjects, regardless of whether they are co-referential (8a) or not (8b)

In (8c), želeti ‘want’, a good candidate for a control verb, allows two overt co-referential subjects

(8) a. Marija i ja treba(-mo) da (*MI) ostane-mo tamo.
     Mary and I need-1PL DA we stay-PRES.1PL there
     intended: ‘Mary and I need us to stay there’

      Janko need-3SG DA Peter stay-3SG at home
      intended: ‘Janko needs Peter to stay at home’ (adapted from Arsenijevič & Simonović 2014:299)

   c. Marija želi-∅ da (ONA) ostane-∅ tamo.
      Mary want-3SG DA she stay-3SG there
      intended: ‘Mary wants herself to stay at home’
• Wurmbrand (1999): Only verbs with underlying external arguments can be passivized

• Control verbs, but not raising verbs, have thematic external arguments

• Trebati cannot be passivized → it is a raising (unaccusative) verb

(9) a. Biljka je zalive-n-a.
   plant AUX.3SG water-PPTCP-FEM.SG
   intended: ‘The plant has been watered’

b. Ovde je trča-n-o.
   here AUX.3SG run-PPTCP-NEUT.SG
   ‘There was running here’

c. *Ovde je dođe-n-o.
   here AUX.3SG arrive-PPTCP-NEUT.SG
   intended: ‘There was arriving here’

d. *Treb-n-o je da se zali-j-u bilj-k-e.
   need-PPTCP-NEUT.SG AUX.3SG DA SE water-3PL plant-NOM.FEM.PL
   intended: ‘Watering the plants was needed’

• Evidence from idioms (see Appendix)

4. The preverbal NP is a subject

• Recall (2), repeated here as (10):

(10) a. Studentkinje su treba-l-e da peva-ju.
   students.FEM AUX.3PL need-PTCP-FEM.PL DA sing-PRES.3PL

b. Studentkinje je treba-l-o da peva-ju.
   students.FEM AUX.3SG need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA sing-PRES.3PL
   ‘The (female) students needed to sing’

• UNANSWERED QUESTION: Why is trebati in (10b) not agreeing with the preverbal NP?

• POSSIBLE ANSWER: The NP in (10b) is A’-moving (e.g., to a topic position)

→ This idea seems immediately suspect since the NP does not show any of the usual properties of topics; for example, it can be a universally/negatively quantified NP and it can occur in a new information context (see Appendix for examples)

• We can use facts about relativization to argue for the subject status of the preverbal NP

• In SC relative clauses, it is generally impossible to place an NP between the relative pronoun and the subject (11a)

• The NP that precedes (both personal and impersonal) trebati is still possible (11b)
(11) a. *[ˇCovek [kog [Marija i Jovana], pro/Marko tvrdi-∅ ] da tı, man who Mary and Jovana pro/Marko claim-3SG DA
vid-e] je visok.
see-3PL is tall

‘The man who Mary and Jovana s/he/Marko claims see is tall’

b. [ˇCovek [kog [Marija i Jovana], treba-∅/-ju da tı, vid-e]]
man who Mary and Jovana need-3SG 3PL DA see-3PL

je visok.
is tall

‘The man who Mary and Jovana need to see is tall’

• Assume that SC relative clauses have the structure in (12a) and that SC CPs project only one specifier (see Richards 1997)

• In the offending structure, spec CP is occupied by the relative pronoun kog ‘whom’, but Marija i Jovana ‘Marija and Jovana’ is trying to fit in the same position (12b)

• The fact that Marija i Jovana ‘Marija and Jovana’ in (12c) is not competing with the relative pronoun strongly suggests that it is in an A-position, e.g., spec TP (23c)

(12) a. [NP man [CP whom C [+rel] [TP ...Marija see-3SG... ]]]

b. [NP man [CP whom // [Marija and Jovana], C [+rel] [TP claim-3SG... tı]]]

c. [NP man [CP whom C [+rel] [TP [Marija and Jovana], need(-3PL)... tı]]]

NB: See the Appendix for scope-related and binding evidence to the same effect

5. Analysis

5.1. First, some more data

• The subject can stay in the embedded clause if trebati is in the non-agreeing form (13a), but not if it is in the agreeing form (13b)

• This data poses a problem for analyses on which raising applies in order to satisfy unvalued features on the nominal (e.g., Case, Chomsky 2008)

• Motivating the raising though a movement probe on matrix T will have difficulties explaining why the subject in (13a) can remain in situ

• Possible timing analyses, which rely on the presence of two features (e.g. [N*] and [uϕ]) on T and capitalize on the order in which these features are satisfied, will also have trouble accounting for the availability of (13a)

(13) a. Trebal-o je da Marija i ja ide-mo na pijacu.
needed-NEUT.SG AUX.3SG DA Mary and I go-1PL on market
‘Mary and I should have gone to the market’

b. *Trebal-e smo da Marija i ja idemo na pijacu.
needed-FEM.PL AUX.1PL DA Mary and I go-1PL on market
5.2. A-movement is free

**INGREDIENTS:**

i. Suppose that assume that **probing for agreement is only downward, and based on c-command**

ii. Suppose also that the agreement probe on T cannot ‘see’ the subject NP it its base generated position (phasal complement?); (13) points to this conclusion

iii. Assume further that **there is no movement probe**—A-movement is ‘free’; more precisely, (this kind of) A-movement fully optional, it can occur at any stage of the derivation (or not), and it is constrained only by the requirement that the output be well-formed (see Baker & Vinokurova 2010 and Rezac et al. 2014 for explorations of this idea in different domains)

- So, why is raising optional?
  → Because there is no movement probe; the subject NP can move or stay in situ

- Why can the subject stay low and unagreed with?
  → Because the subject-NP can clearly be licensed in situ, and agreement probing is free to happen and fail (Preminger 2011, 2014)

- Why does it look like agreement with the preverbal NP is optional?
  → Because movement (of this kind) can freely occur at any step of the derivation, ipso facto it can occur before or after agreement probing

- Precisely when or where is the subject (in)visible to the agreement probe?
  → In answering this question, we first need to determine the identity of the embedded complement’s topmost projection

→ Fortunately, Todorović & Wurmbrand (2020) have devised diagnostics that split BCS da-complements into three groups: vP, TP and CP; according to all of these, **trebati behaves like a verb that takes a TP complement**

- If the embedded clause is a TP, why can’t the matrix verb agree with the subject in situ (13)?
  → One possible answer: because the embedded clause is a phase

- If this is the case, agreement should be possible when the subject is at the phase edge (i.e. in spec TP), but not when the subject stays low (e.g. in spec vP)

- If da ‘da’ is in T, then the subject in (13b) is indeed lower than spec TP, and therefore inaccessible to the agreement probe

- When the subject and da ‘da’ switch places, the sentence becomes grammatical (14) **with the agreement on the matrix predicate**

(14) Trebal-e smo Marija i ja da idemo na pijacu.

‘Mary and I should have gone to the market’
• However, SC is a language that allows rampant scrambling; therefore, we cannot know from (14) alone whether the subject is in spec TP of the embedded clause, or whether it has A-moved to the matrix, and everything else (basically the participle) was scrambled to the left of it.

• Recall SC has a class of NPIs (\(i\)-NPIs) that can only be licensed by superordinate negation; furthermore, there is another class of NPIs (\(ni\)-NPIs) that are licensed only by clause-mate negation (Progovac 1991).

• We can use this to test whether the subject in (14) is at the edge of the embedded clause, or whether it has moved to the matrix.

• In fact, it seem that both options are possible.

• In (15a), the subject is in spec TP of the embedded clause; the \(i\)-NPI is licensed by the superordinate negation, and the matrix verb can agree because the subject is at the edge of the phase.

• In (15b), the subject has raised into the matrix clause and the other matrix material has been scrambled to the left of it; the \(ni\)-NPI is licensed by clause-mate negation, and the matrix verb agrees with the subject.

(15) a. Ne bi treba-o i-ko da to uradi.
    NEG AUX.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG i-who DA that do.3SG
    'No one should do that'

b. Ne bi treba-o ni-ko da to uradi.
    NEG AUX.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG ni-who DA that do.3SG
    'No one should do that'

• Sanity check:

→ (16a) is good because the \(i\)-NPI is licensed by superordinate negation + default agreement.

→ (16b) is bad because the agreement probe can’t reach the low subject.

→ (16c) is bad because the \(ni\)-NPI is not licensed by clause-mate negation.

(16) a. Ne bi treba-lo da i-ko to uradi.
    NEG AUX.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.NEUT.SG DA i-who that do.3SG
    'No one should do that'

b. *Ne bi treba-o da i-ko to uradi.
    NEG AUX.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG DA i-who that do.3SG
    'No one should do that'

c. *Ne bi treba-(l)-o da ni-ko to uradi.
    NEG AUX.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.NEUT/MASC.SG DA ni-who that do.3SG
    'No one should do that'

SUMMARY:

• If probing for agreement occurs when the subject is in spec vP of the embedded clause, it will fail.

→ Since A-movement is ‘free’, it is also free to not occur; the subject-NP can clearly be licensed in situ (cf. (13a)).
The NP can stay low, out-of-reach of the higher agreement probe, which fails to find a target and therefore shows the characteristic morphology associated with unvalued $\phi$-features (17a)

- If movement to spec TP of the embedded clause applies first, the relevant NP will be in the domain of matrix T when agreement probing takes place

→ The result is $\phi$-feature agreement between the subject and the matrix T (17b)

→ As before, movement of the subject to the matrix clause is free to apply after this or not

- This analysis explains the 5-out-of-6 grammaticality pattern I represent schematically in (18)

(17) 

a. **agreement first**: $T[\phi] \text{ need-3SG} \ldots \text{ [TP da [vP Marija and Jovana ...} 

b. **movement first**: $T[\phi; 3\text{PL}] \text{ need-3PL} \ldots \text{ [TP [Marija and Jovana], da [vP }$...

(18)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP.3PL – need-3SG – DA</th>
<th>need-3SG – NP.3PL – DA</th>
<th>need-3SG – DA – NP.3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP.3PL – need-3PL – DA</td>
<td>need-3PL – NP.3PL – DA</td>
<td>*need-3PL – DA – NP.3PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. **Evidence from hybrid forms**

- Hybrid forms, where one member of {auxiliary, participle} agrees with the subject, and the other one does not, are not at all uncommon (see Klikovac 2011:8)

- Crucially, the element that agrees in these hybrid forms is always the auxiliary and never the participle (19)

(19) 

a. Sada **bi-h** ja treba-l-o da se naljutim.  
   now **AUX,AOR-1SG** I need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA SE be-angry  
   ‘Now I should become angry at you’

b. Iako **su** koncerti treba-l-o da predstavljaju...  
   although **AUX,3PL** concerts need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA represent  
   ‘Even though the concerts were supposed to represent...’

c. Takođe **bi-ste** treba-l-o da budete pažljivi prilikom  
   Also **AUX,AOR-2PL** need-PTCP-NEUT.SG DA be careful when  
   korišćenja rumenila...  
   using blush...  
   ‘You should also be careful when using blush...’

- Assuming that agreement probing happens in lockstep with structure building, our analysis predicts the pattern in (19)

- In the first step of deriving the pattern in (19c), the subject is low; the participle probes for agreement and does not find a goal—the $\phi$ features of the participle stay unvalued and are spelled-out as neuter singular (20a)

- Before matrix T is merged, the subject can either move or stay in situ

- If the subject stays in situ (or moves after agreement probing), we get the familiar non-agreeing pattern, e.g. (10b) and (13a)
If the subject moves to the specifier of the embedded clause before agreement probing, matrix T will agree with the subject, and we will get the hybrid pattern in (19c), see (20b)

(20) a. **first step**: [uϕ] on Part spelled-out as NEUT. SG.

\[\text{[PART} \text{ Part [uϕ]} \text{ need-PTCP-NEUT.SG [TP DA you...]}\]

b. **second step**: T agrees with the moved subject

\[\text{[TP} \text{ T [ϕ:2pl] AUX-2PL [PART} \text{ Part [uϕ]} \text{ need-PTCP-NEUT.SG [TP [you], DA t...]}\]

6. Beyond SC

- Recall the English pattern in (1), repeated here as (21): the embedded subject must raise out of a non-finite clause, and it cannot raise out of a finite clause

(21) a. John seemed [TP <John> to like Mary].

b. It seemed [CP that John liked Mary].

- Recall also our definition of ‘free’ A-movement: it is fully optional, it can occur at any stage of the derivation (or not), and it is constrained only by the requirement that the output be well-formed

- Are there independent reasons to think that the output in (21a) would not be well-formed had the subject not moved out of the embedded clause?

→ Yes, since non-finite T cannot license a DP in its specifier position

- Are there independent reasons to think that the output in (21b) would not be well-formed had the subject moved out of the embedded clause?

→ Yes; assuming that the embedded CP is a phase, the subject would have to A’-move from spec TP to spec CP, and then A-move to spec TP of the matrix clause–this would be a case of improper movement (Chomsky 1973, May 1979, Williams 2003, Abels 2008)

- Why does the SC case not constitute a case of improper movement?

→ Because it seems that the complement clause is a TP, according to the diagnostics in Todorović & Wurmbrand 2020

7. Conclusion

- I have argued that the SC verb *trebati* ‘need’ is a raising-to-subject verb

- Accounting for the full range of data observed with *trebati* does not seem possible with ‘mainstream’ generative analyses of raising-to-subject

- Instead, I showed that the data is best accounted for under an approach where (this kind of) A-movement is fully optional, it can occur at any stage of the derivation (or not), and it is constrained only by the requirement that the output be well-formed

---

1This is also true of the SC infinitive, but recall that the DA-complement of *trebati* ‘need’ is finite
I also showed that this approach can be extended to English-type raising → there is no trigger for raising per se; rather, independent factors (Case licensing and improper movement) filter out the impossible constructions.
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8. Appendix

8.1. Restructuring?

• Trebati forms part of a bi-clausal structure throughout its syntactic life

• Restructuring verbs allow long object movement, (Wurmbrand 2014); trebati does not (22b)
(22) a. Estas paredes están siendo terminadas de pint-ar.
   ‘They were finishing painting these walls’

   b. *Ovi zadaci su treba-ni da urad-imo.
   ‘We should have done the tasks’

Restructuring verbs allow clitic climbing, cf. (13a) from Wurmbrand 2014; *trebati with a finite complement does not (23b)

*Trebat* can also take an infinitival complement – clitic climbing is then allowed (23c)

(23) a. Marek ją zdecydował się przeczytać tCL.
   Marek it decided REFL read.INF tCL
   ‘Marek decided to read it’

   b. ??Jovana ga je trebal-a/-o da kup-i tCL.
   Jovana it AUX.3SG needed-FEM.SG/NEUT.SG DA buy-3PL tCL
   *intended:* ‘Jovana should have bought it’

   c. Jovana ga je trebal-a kupi-ti tCL.
   Jovana it AUX.3SG needed-FEM.SG buy-INF tCL
   ‘Jovana should have bought it’

8.2. Raising: Evidence from idioms

It is well known that idioms can survive under raising, but not under control (24a-b)

The explanation that is given for this contrast is that the idiom is introduced as a syntactic constituent in the raising structure, but not in the control structure.

For the BCS idiom in (25a), we observe that the idiomatic meaning is preserved with *trebati* ‘need’ (25b), but not with *želeti* ‘want’ (25c), further showing that *trebati* is a raising verb

(24) a. [The cat] seemed to be out of the bag.

   b. [The cat] tried to be out of the bag.

(25) a. I vrapci na grani to već znaj-u.
   even sparrows on branch that already know-3PL
   ‘Everyone knows that’

   b. I vrapci na grani treba-(ju) da to već znaj-u.
   even sparrows on branch need-3PL da that already know-3PL
   ‘Everyone should know that’

   c. I vrapci na grani žel-e da to već znaj-u.
   even sparrows on branch need-3PL da that already know-3PL
   ‘Even the sparrows on the branch want to know that’, *no idiomatic meaning*
8.3. The preverbal NP is not a topic

- Topics need to be under the scope of existential quantification (Reinhart 1976, a.o); universally and negatively quantified NPs are topic resistant, but they occur freely with *trebati* (26)

(26) a. Svi treba(-ju) da prim-e vakcinu.
   everyone need-3PL DA get-1PL vaccine
   ‘Everyone needs to get the vaccine’

   b. Ni-ko ne treba(-∅) da prim-i vakcinu.
   NEG-who NEG need-3SG DA get -3SG
   ‘No one should get the vaccine’

- Topicalization is also impossible in a new information context (27a), but sentence-initial NPs with *trebati* are fine in this same context (27b)

(27) Context: "What’s happening?"

   a. [#[Marija i Jovana]i pro misli-m da t_i id-u.
      Mary and Jovana pro think-1SG DA t go-3PL
      ‘Mary and Jovana, I think they are going’

   b. [Marija i Jovana]i treba(-ju) da t id-u.
      Mary and Jovana need-3PL DA t go-3PL
      ‘Mary and Jovana need to go’

8.4. The preverbal NP is a subject

8.4.1. Evidence from scope

- While it is not (cross-linguistically) unheard of that A’-movement can change scope relations, A-movement regularly does so

- (28) has two readings resulting from the interaction of the negation and the quantifier

- The inverse scope reading, where the negation scopes over the quantifier, may result from the quantifier’s position in the embedded clause before raising

- Additionally, the quantifier may scope over the negation, suggesting that the NP *svi vakcinisan* ‘all vaccinated (people)’ has moved to an A-position above the negation

(28) [Svi vakcinisan-i], ne treba(-ju) da t_i se ošeća-ju sigurno.
   all vaccinated-PL NEG need-3PL DA SE feel-3PL safe
   ‘It is not the case that all vaccinated people should feel safe’  NEG > ALL
   ‘For all vaccinated people, it is the case that they shouldn’t feel safe’  ALL > NEG

8.4.2. Evidence from binding

- *Svoj ‘own’* is a subject-oriented anaphor; in (29a), I show that *svoj* is bound by the subject even though another NP (*Jovani*) is structurally closer to the anaphor

- The sentence-initial NP in the non-agreeing *trebati* construction also binds this anaphor (29b), suggesting that it is a subject
A potential problem: the adverbial containing the reflexive svoj ‘own’ in (29b) may be modifying the lexical verb naslikati ‘paint’ and being bound by the trace of Marija ‘Mary’ in the embedded clause.

However, we can be certain that the adverbial containing the reflexive svoj ‘own’ in (29b) is modifying trebati and not the lexical verb because the two adverbials in (29b), namely ‘of her own accord’ and ‘on the authorities’ order’ cannot modify the same predicate—the result is a semantic anomaly (29c).

   Marija.NOM and Milica.NOM give Jovana.DAT own-FEM.ACC bag-FEM.ACC
   ‘Marija and Milica are giving Jovana their bag’

   b. [Marija]j treba(-∅) svoj-om da ti naslika mural
   Marija need-3SG own-FEM.INS will-FEM.INS DA paint mural
   na naređenje vlasti.
   on order authorities
   ‘It needs to be of her own accord that Milica paints a mural on the authorities’ order’

   c. #[Marija]j je naslikala mural svoj-om volj-om na
   Marija AUX.3SG painted mural own-FEM.INS will-FEM.INS on
   naređenje vlasti.
   order authorities
   ‘Mary painted a mural of her own accord on the authorities’ order’

8.5. Relativization

Recall that the contrast in (11) was used to argue that the preverbal NP with trebati does not occupy the same position as A’-moved NPs.

In some cases, the acceptability of sentences similar to (11a) improves, e.g. (30).

The crucial (and only) difference between (11a) and (30) is that the matrix verb has an overt agreement marker, which may make the presence of pro (and, concomitantly, the fact that Marija i Jovana is not the subject) more salient.

I would argue, however, that the contrast between (11) and (30) is purely about acceptability, not about grammaticality; more specifically, (30) may be easier to parse than (11a), but it is not more grammatical than (11a).

If the structure with trebati (11b) and the one in (30) were parallel, we would expect (30) to be perfect, contrary to fact.

(30) ??Čovek kog Marija i Jovana pro tvrdi-mo da vid-e je
   man who Mary and Jovana pro claim-1PL DA see-3PL is
   visok.
   tall
   ‘The man who Mary and Jovana we claim see is tall’