In this paper, I will argue that Contrastive Topic (CT) in Korean is formed from a Contrast operator being associated with Focus. The core of this argument is that ‘nun’, a morphological marker for Topic in Korean, has a Contrast meaning by accompanying a Contrast operator. After discussing the meaning of ‘Contrast’ in CT compared with another focus sensitive operator ‘only’, I will examine the scope interaction between CT and ‘only’. This process will support the argument that CT is an association of Focus with an operator of ‘Contrast’, whose meaning is from the built-in semantics of a morphological marker ‘-nun’. In both ‘only’ and CT reading, the marked item is the only item that has the property of the predicate. The fundamental difference is this: the proposition that has ‘-nun’ (CT) asserts two things: one assertion is that only the marked item has the predicate property and the second assertion is that the alternatives have their own property that is minimally contrastive in a way triggered by ‘Contrast trigger’. Previous work has argued that ‘only’ makes assertion about the alternatives but ‘CT’ does not (Hara 2004). My argument is almost the opposite. In the ‘Exhaustive’ reading of ‘only’, the same predicate applies to the marked item and all the alternatives. The marked item is the only item that has a positive truth value with respect to the predicate, while the alternatives have the exactly same predicate with a negative truth value. The ‘Contrast’ reading of CT does not merely mean that the negative value of a predicate applies to alternatives, but that there must be one element that contrasts between the marked item and alternatives. The element can be any item in the sentence. Let us call it ‘Contrast trigger’. These contrast triggers are usually focused and the Focus evokes alternatives, which make contrasting properties for the alternatives. This explains why CT is very often followed by Focus. However, it is not always the case that CT is followed by Focus. Sometimes, CT alone seems to appear. How can it be explained? There are two cases where the Contrast trigger apparently does not appear but actually exists. This Contrast trigger can sometimes be a positive/negative marker. When the default unseen positive assertion operator is the Contrast trigger, the only available alternative value for this is the negated assertion. In this case, the ‘nun’ reading and ‘only’ reading are identical. When the unseen default positive assertion operator is focused, no characteristic prosodic property appears, since there is no physical constituent that prosody can work on (the reading of (1a) and (2b)). The second case is when the Contrast trigger is assigned to the ‘assertion’ operator. The property that is applied to alternatives can be informally interpreted as ‘the speaker cannot make assertion about it’(the reading of (1b) and (2c)). This is the part that previous literature has discussed and concluded to be a meaning and function of CT. However, in my theory, this is just one part of the whole Contrast paradigm. Therefore, only when no overt Focus appears, does the same meaning with ‘only’ or the uncertainty meaning appear. In other words, when Focus follows CT, the ‘uncertainty’ meaning and the ‘only’ meaning should not be possible as in (2). In my theory that treats CT parallel with ‘only’ as an association of Focus with an operator, the scope difference between (a) and (b) in (3) and (4) can be explained by the interaction of these two operators. In this system, CT is categorized under Focus, not under Topic, in the Information Structure. If we accept this, 1) we do not need to distinguish two types of Topic (there is only D-topic) 2) we do not need to stipulate that Topic (only Contrastive Topic) introduces an alternative set as Focus, and 3) we can solve a long standing controversy whether ‘-nun’ has two types of usage as a thematic topic marking and a contrastive topic marking.
(1) Hillary-ka [\text{CT ARIZONA-EYESE-NUN}] inki-ka manassta.
Hillary-Nom Arizona-in-Nun popularity-Nom be much-past
a. Hillary had a lot of popularity in Arizona but not in other regions.
b. Hillary had a lot of popularity in Arizona but I do not have information about the popularity of other regions. (I do not know about other regions)

(2) Hillary-ka [\text{CT ARIZONA-EYESE-NUN}] [\text{INKI-KA}] manassta.
Hillary-Nom Arizona-in-Nun popularity-Nom be much-past
a. Hillary had a lot of popularity in Arizona but in other regions, she had much of other things.
b. #^1 Hillary had a lot of popularity in Arizona but not in other regions.
c. # Hillary had a lot of popularity in Arizona but I do not have information about the popularity of other regions. (I do not know about other regions)

(3) [Context] John owns a car dealer shop. He has his own philosophy in selling his cars. The Bentley, different from other cars that John has, is a valuable and expensive car. John wanted to sell it only to a special person that he thinks who deserves the car.
      
      John-Nom Bentley-Nun Mary-to-Only sell-past
      A Bentley, John sold it only to Mary (in contrast to this, for other cars, John sold it to anybody)
   b. #John-i [\text{MARY-HANTEY-MAN}] [\text{BENTLEY-NUN}] palassta.
      
      John-Nom Mary-to-Only Bentley-Nun sell-past
      Only to Mary, John sold (at least) a Bentley (but not any other cars).

(4) [Context] Because of the critical energy crisis, the government forced John to stop selling cars for a while. However, John realized how much his friend, Mary, needs a car. He decided to sell a small car secretly only to Mary.
   a. #John-i [\text{SMART CAR-NUN}] [\text{MARY-HANTEY-MAN}] palassta.
      
      John-Nom Smart Car-Nun Mary-to-Only sell-past
      A Smart Car, John sold it only to Mary (in contrast to this, for other cars, John sold it to anybody)
   b. John-i [\text{MARY-HANTEY-MAN}] [\text{SMART CAR-NUN}] palassta.
      
      John-Nom Mary-to-Only Smart Car-Nun sell-past
      Only to Mary, John sold (at least) a Smart Car (but not any other cars).

^1 '#' means infelicity.