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SUMMARY
The Jan Mayen microcontinent (JMMC) in the NE Atlantic was created through two Cenozoic rift episodes. Originally part of East Greenland, the JMMC rifted from NW Europe during the Early Eocene under extensive magmatism. The eastern margin is conjugate to the Møre–Faeroes volcanic margin. The western JMMC margin underwent prolonged extension before it finally separated from East Greenland during the Late Oligocene. Here we present the modelling by forward/inverse ray tracing of two wide-angle seismic profiles acquired using Ocean Bottom Seismometers, across the northern and the southern JMMC. Early Eocene breakup magmatism at the eastern JMMC produced an igneous thickness of 7–9 km in the north, and 12–14 km in the south. While the continent is clear in the north, the southern JMMC appears to be affected by later Icelandic magmatism. Reduced seismic velocity and increased crustal thickness are compatible with continental crust adjacent to the volcanic margin in the south, but the continental presence towards the Iceland shelf is less clear. Our magnetic track off the southern JMMC gives seafloor spreading rates comparable to that of the conjugate Møre Margin. Transition to ultraslow seafloor spreading occurs at \( \sim \)43 Ma, indicating onset of major deformation of the JMMC. Calculating the igneous thickness—mean \( V_P \) relationship at the eastern volcanic margin gives the typical positive correlation seen elsewhere on the NE Atlantic margins. The results indicate temperature driven breakup magmatism under passive mantle upwelling, with a maximum mantle temperature anomaly of \( \sim \)50 \(^\circ\)C in the north and 90–150 \(^\circ\)C in the south.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The Jan Mayen Ridge (JMR) is a north-trending bathymetric feature in the Norwegian–Greenland Sea (Fig. 1). While the northern part consists of a single ridge, south of the Jan Mayen Trough there are several smaller ridges. Early studies of the JMR pointed out its role as a microcontinent (the Jan Mayen microcontinent: JMMC), first rifted off the Norwegian Margin with Greenland, and then off Greenland itself (Talwani & Eldholm 1977). Later studies further investigated the structure and volcanism of the ridge (e.g. Myhre et al. 1984; Skogseid & Eldholm 1987; Gudlaugsson et al. 1988). Seaward dipping reflectors observed on the eastern margin are similar to features on the mid-Norwegian margin (Skogseid & Eldholm 1987), where Ocean Drilling Program wells penetrated basalt flows deposited during breakup (e.g. Planke 1994). The conjugate margin is the volcanic Møre Margin off mid-Norway, where seafloor spreading initiated at \( \sim \)54 Ma on the Aegir Ridge (e.g. Berndt et al. 2001; Torsvik et al. 2001; Lundin & Doré 2002).

Seafloor spreading on the Aegir Ridge became magma starved soon after the initial pulse of breakup magmatism (Breivik et al. 2006). There was also less breakup magmatism in the north than in the south on the Møre Margin (Berndt et al. 2001). The Aegir Ridge became extinct around (\( \sim \)25–28 Ma), when the JMMC rifted off east Greenland and oceanic spreading shifted to the presently active Kolbeinsey Ridge (Vogt et al. 1980; Nunns 1983; Mjelde et al. 2008a). Continental stretching commenced at least 20 Myr before Late Oligocene breakup occurred in the Jan Mayen Basin, and the structure is dominated by the rifting from Greenland, with many of the major normal faults facing westwards (Gudlaugsson et al. 1988; Kuvaas & Kodaira 1997). The northwestern part of the JMMC has been mapped by regional Ocean Bottom Seismometer data (OBS), documenting the Late Oligocene non-volcanic, passive margin development (Kodaira et al. 1998; Mjelde et al. 2007). The limit of the JMMC to the south is unclear, as the bathymetric ridges disappear, and the bathymetry rises towards the Iceland shelf (Fig. 1).
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This paper describes the traveltime modelling of two OBS profiles acquired across the western Norway Basin and the JMMC/Iceland Plateau. In addition, we use magnetic track data collected with the OBS profiles to constrain early seafloor spreading rates and magmatic productivity. Profile 8-00 in the north is near conjugate to an OBS profile at the Møre margin (Breivik et al. 2006, Fig. 1), while Profile 7-00 is just north of conjugate to the iSIMM OBS profile at the northern Faeroes Margin (White et al. 2008, Fig. 1).
We will present our profiles in light of recent results from the conjugate margin. The regional discussion of the JMMC extent will also make use of satellite-derived gravity (Andersen et al. 2008), as well as ship/flight track derived magnetic maps (Verhoeff et al. 1996; Gernigon et al. 2009).

2 DATA ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING

The survey was performed during the summer of the year 2000, by the R/V Håkon Mosby of the University of Bergen. The project has been conducted in collaboration between the Department of Earth Science, University of Bergen, the Norwegian Petroleum Directorate (NPD), and the Institute of Seismology and Volcanology (ISV), Hokkaido University, Sapporo. An array consisting of four equal sized Bolt air guns with a total volume of 78.66 l (4800 in.3) were fired every 200 m for each OBS profile, and the data were recorded by ISV three-component OBSs with analog or digital recording. A total of eight OBSs containing good data were recovered for Profile 8-00 (330 km long), while three OBSs failed. Profile 7-00 (380 km long) presented here is part of a longer profile continuing north of Iceland (Brandsdóttir et al. 2008). One instrument failed on the eastern part, while 10 OBSs returned good data sets.

The pre-processing consists of linear clock drift correction, extracting a 60 s record length for each shot, and linking to navigation. OBS positions are also corrected for drift along line where this is apparent. Navigation was performed by a differential global positioning system. The OBS data processing shown in the figures consists of a 5–12 Hz bandpass filter, offset-dependent amplitude scaling and spiking deconvolution. The P-wave data time axis is reduced by a velocity of 8.0 km s⁻¹. Surface seismic data were recorded by an analogue, single channel streamer for both profiles. Magnetic data were logged every 5 s by a GeoMetrics G-801 proton precession magnetometer towed 180 m behind the ship. Magnetic processing consists of repositioning, adjusting for short-term field fluctuations from base stations in Leirvogur, Iceland and Jan Mayen, and correcting to the International Geomagnetic Reference Field (IGRF-11). The geomagnetic field was quiet during the recording period, and the quality of the data good.

3 P-WAVE MODELLING

The P-wave data, recorded by the OBS vertical components, were modelled by forward/inverse ray tracing software (Zelt & Smith 1992). The model is solved layer by layer from top to bottom. The inversion routine is best used on a limited number of depth and/or velocity nodes from a single layer covered by several OBS data sets, and is routinely used for solving deeper layers. The software also evaluates the goodness of fit between interpreted and modelled traveltimes using \( \chi^2 \) analysis. The \( \chi^2 \) value weights the mismatch between observed and calculated arrival times by the estimated interpretation uncertainty, so that a value of 1 or lower per phase signifies a fit. The main uncertainty in interpretation may come from the difficulty to pick the first onset of an arrival. For the short offset arrivals from the sedimentary layers and uppermost crust the uncertainty is estimated to ±50 ms, while later arrivals originating deeper are assigned an uncertainty of ±100 ms. A few indistinct arrivals have been assigned a greater uncertainty.

Profile 8-00 crosses the northern JMR and the oceanic basin to the East Jan Mayen Fracture Zone (EJMFZ, Fig. 1). Profile 7-00 was acquired across the southern JMMC/Iceland Plateau, and covers the oceanic basin to the Aegir Ridge (Fig. 1). The quality of the recorded data is very good for both profiles. The complete P-wave data with models are shown in the Supporting Information section of this paper. The single channel seismic (SCS) reflection lines were used to construct initial models, where the top of the oceanic crust stands out clearly along most parts of the profiles, but no details can be seen below that (Fig. 2). Sedimentary velocities are low, and only return identifiable refracted waves on a few OBSs, but there are numerous reflections from the top of the basement. Both indicate a sedimentary velocity below ~2 km s⁻¹ for the two uppermost layers, except for near the Iceland shelf in the south.

The uppermost layers are densely parametrized by depth nodes, where the echo sounding and SCS data constrain water depth and near-surface structure. Typical node spacing is 2–4 km for upper layers, while it is mostly 10–30 km for the lower layers within the basement and for the Moho. Velocity nodes are fewer, usually spaced 20–50 km apart for the whole model. The sedimentary layers have poor velocity control, and have very few velocity nodes. Reflections that could not be tied to the velocity layer boundaries were fitted by introducing floating reflectors, visible as short lines in the figures. Labelled phase codes are: \( P_s \) sedimentary refraction, \( P_{g1} \) upper basement refraction, \( P_{g2} \) middle basement refraction, \( P_{a1} \) and \( P_{a4} \) lower basement refractions, \( P_u \) upper-mantle refraction, \( P_{g4} \) intra-basement reflection, \( P_{mb} \) Moho reflection and \( P_fP \) upper-mantle reflection.

3.1 Profile 8-00: the northern Jan Mayen microcontinent

The JMMC is constrained by OBSs 35–41 (Fig. 1). The vertical component data for OBSs 35 and 39, together with the model ray tracing and the traveltime fit, are presented in Figs 3 and 4. The velocity model is shown in Fig. 5. See Supporting Information for all data and models. Profile 8-00 is close to the older OBS Profile 4–95 located 10–30 km to the north (Kodaira et al. 1998). The older profile covers the western and central parts of the JMMC, but not the eastern margin. Both profiles show an asymmetric crustal root underneath the bathymetric ridge, with the thickest crust displaced to the eastern side (Fig. 5). They also show a thickness of 0.5–1.5 km of sediments draping the ridge, and a faulted relief of sedimentary rocks underneath. The large westward facing normal fault seen in the SCS profile on the eastern flank at ~60 km distance has a throw of ~0.5 s two-way time (TWT, Fig. 2), corresponding to ~500 m. The effect of the fault is also seen in a distinct offset of the seismic arrival times above it on the OBS data (Figs 3 and 4), agreeing very well with this throw. The effect involves most strata up to near seafloor, and may therefore belong to the faults created by the separation of the JMMC from East Greenland.

Earlier studies based on multichannel seismic reflection (MCS) data indicate that there is a basaltic layer on the eastern JMMC flank in the north, often associated with seafloor dipping reflectors (Myhre et al. 1984; Skogseid & Eldholm 1987; Gudlaugsson et al. 1988). Kodaira et al. (1998) included an ~1-km-thick layer of basalts in their OBS model, though the thickness was unconstrained by the OBS data due to velocity inversion underneath. Profile 8-00 lacks a layer with a velocity near what they found (4.6–4.8 km s⁻¹) and there is no sign of a velocity inversion (Fig. 5), thus we cannot identify it. Crystalline basement with P-wave velocity above 6 km s⁻¹ was found at depths between 4 and 6 km within the ridge. The model of Kodaira et al. (1998), 30 km to the north, indicates up to ~5–6- km-thick sedimentary rocks within the ridge west of our model.
Figure 2. Single channel streamer reflection data recorded with OBS Profile 8-00 (upper) and Profile 7-00 (lower), shown in two-way time (TWT). Numbered black dots represent OBS locations. Coincident gravity (Andersen et al. 2008) and magnetic data (this study) are shown above each seismic section. Magnetic: dashed line, gravity: solid line.

Maximum Moho depth is 16.6 km (Fig. 5), compared to 19.7 km of the older profile located 25 km farther to the north. Both profiles show lower crustal velocity above 6.7 km s$^{-1}$ under the JMR, while our profile documents further velocity increase to more than 7 km s$^{-1}$ to the east. This velocity continues into the lower oceanic crust, indicating a gabbroic composition. The transition between this and the continental crust farther west is gradual, which could indicate a zone of magmatic intrusions into the lower continental crust, similar to that of the iSIMM profile north of the Faeroes (White et al. 2008). This could also offer an explanation for the asymmetry between the bathymetry and the Moho relief, as a gabbroic lower crust would be stronger than the more quartz-rich lithology, which the lower velocities indicate farther west. Thus the volcanic margin would sustain less tectonic deformation.

The oceanic crust is 5–5.5 km thick (Fig. 5), comparable to that of oceanic crust near the Norwegian Møre Margin (Breivik et al. 2006).
The velocity structure of the upper oceanic crust is well constrained by the OBS data. The top is smooth near the JMMC, and the velocity of the upper oceanic crust fairly high (~5.5 km s$^{-1}$) compared to normal (White et al. 1992). The top basement becomes rougher and the oceanic layer 2 velocity decreases towards the EJMFZ. The EJMFZ itself forms a deep trough in the basement, but there is no Moho relief or velocity signature of it in the lower crust.

The velocity structure of the upper oceanic crust is well constrained by the OBS data. The top is smooth near the JMMC, and the velocity of the upper oceanic crust fairly high (~5.5 km s$^{-1}$) compared to normal (White et al. 1992). The top basement becomes rougher and the oceanic layer 2 velocity decreases towards the EJMFZ. The EJMFZ itself forms a deep trough in the basement, but there is no Moho relief or velocity signature of it in the lower crust.

### 3.2 Profile 7-00: the southern Jan Mayen microcontinent

The profile presented here is part of a longer profile extending onto the Icelandic shelf (Fig. 1). The SCS profile shows top basement well for most of the profile, except for the westernmost 40 km, where there is a zone of strong reflectivity within the sediments (Fig. 2). We interpret this to be volcani-clastic material derived from the Icelandic shelf located 20 km to the west. The sedimentary thickness is between 1 and 1.5 km. For most of the profile the velocity is below 2 km s$^{-1}$, but it increases slightly in the volcani-clastic part. Data with the model ray tracing and the traveltime fit for OBSs 48, 50 and 54 are shown in Figs 6–8, and the velocity model in Fig. 9. See Supporting Information for all data and models.

While top basement in the west is reflective both in the SCS and the OBS data, refracted first arrivals appear not to come from the top basement here, but from a layer at 3–4 km depth. Constraints of the uppermost basement velocity are mainly by the delay of later phases, indicating 2.8–3.5 km s$^{-1}$. The top basement velocity becomes higher (4–5 km s$^{-1}$) from OBS 48 and eastwards, from where top basement reflections and refractions come from the same level. Middle crustal velocities are well constrained by refracted first arrivals for the whole model.

The Moho is constrained at 15–18 km depth by reflections ($P_n$/$P$) and a few refractions through the uppermost mantle ($P_n$). There are two ~30-km-wide areas with marked Moho reliefs between 60 and
190 km in the model. The eastern Moho structure is well constrained by OBSs 48–50 (Figs 6 and 7), and has a relief of up to 3.5 km over adjacent areas. The velocity of the middle and lower crust is well controlled in this part of the model by diving waves. The velocity falls from $\sim 7.0 \text{ s}^{-1}$ to $6.8–6.9 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ above the deepest part of the Moho, also corresponding to a fall in gravity, both indicating a slight compositional change (Fig. 9).

There is a zone with a smooth Moho topography between 180 and 280 km in the model, where the crust thins into the Norway Basin. This is well constrained by OBSs 49–54 (Figs 7 and 8). The internal velocity structure is smoother than in the crust farther west, and the velocity at the bottom of the crust reaches $7.2–7.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This area greatly resembles the volcanic Vøring and Møre Margins on the Norwegian side (e.g. Mjelde et al. 2005; Breivik et al. 2006, 2009), and was similarly created by the extensive breakup magmatism, producing a maximum igneous crustal thickness of $\sim 12 \text{ km}$ immediately after breakup.

The easternmost 100 km of the model covers thin oceanic crust (4–6 km) towards the extinct Aegir Ridge. The structure is typical for very slow spreading ridges, with thin crust and rough basement topography (Malinverno 1991; Dick et al. 2003). The eastern end of the profile ties to OBS Profile 1-00 (Breivik et al. 2006), where both profiles indicate reduced crustal velocities within the Aegir Ridge crust itself.

3.3 Uncertainties and resolution
The precision of seismic models is hard to quantify, as it will eventually depend on a somewhat subjective evaluation of the accuracy of the data and interpretation. Since we want to study the volcanic margin in particular, we target this part located between 180 and 280 km of Profile 7-00. The breakup magmatism is much greater here than at Profile 8-00 in the north, and is therefore the most important
Figure 5. Gridded crustal velocity model for Profile 8-00. The parts of the model not covered by P-wave rays are masked. Rays from floating reflectors do not constrain velocity and are not included in the ray coverage. The OBS locations are numbered on the seafloor. Hachure indicates the continent–ocean transition. Both gravity (red line) (Andersen et al. 2008) and magnetic anomalies (blue line) with anomaly identifications are shown in the panel above.

part of the models if we are to constrain the mantle melting process. The analysis depends on the trade-off between lower crustal velocity and the Moho depth. Higher lower-crustal velocity can be accommodated by increased Moho depth and still produce a reasonable fit for relevant phases. The lower crustal bulk velocity and Moho depth nodes are therefore treated as two groups, and depths or velocities within each group are changed iteratively by the same amount. For each iteration within one group, the other group goes through all iterations for a specified interval. This approach gives a good indication of the minimum and maximum velocity models the data will support. Using \( P_{44} \), \( P_m \) and \( P_n \) phases between 180 and 280 km in the model, 1683 different models were run and the fit statistics extracted. Fig. 10 shows the contoured \( \chi^2 \) and rms \( \Delta T \) fit summary for these model runs. Loss of the ability to trace rays to the observed picks limit the model space further, and is indicated by the background shading. Defined between \( \chi^2 \leq 1 \) and few rays lost, the Moho depth has an uncertainty of \(-0.2 \) km to \(+1.4 \) km, and the lower crustal velocity an uncertainty of \(-0.12 \) km s\(^{-1} \) to \(+0.15 \) km s\(^{-1} \).

Fit statistics indicate the ease of picking arrivals, and the accuracy of the model reproduction for the targeted region. The ray coverage density will in addition indicate which parts of the model are best constrained. We show ray hit counts for \( 2.5 \times 0.25 \) km (distance-depth) grid cells for each model in Fig. 11. For Profile 8-00 in the north, there is good ray coverage both in the upper, middle and lower part of the JMMC. Profile 7-00 in the south has best coverage at mid-crustal levels, but also good lower crustal coverage where the crust is thickest, and of the volcanic margin. The uppermost crust of the margin and the oceanic crust have less coverage.

4 POTENTIAL FIELD DATA

4.1 Gravity maps

The free-air gravity map is derived from satellite altimetry measurements, gridded at 1’ (arc-minute) cells (Andersen et al. 2008; Andersen & Knudsen 2009, Fig. 12B). There is a good correlation between bathymetric relief and the gravity anomalies (Figs 12A and B). Profile 8-00 crosses the southernmost part of the prominent, positive gravity anomaly of more than 90 mGal over the northern JMR (Figs 5 and 12B). East of that, most of the profile has subdued gravity anomalies, before it terminates at the negative anomalies over the EJMFZ. The low to the west of the JMR corresponds to highly stretched continental crust, which is thinner than the oceanic crust farther to the west (Kodaira et al. 1998, Fig. 13).

The gravity minimum on Profile 7-00 is \(-19 \) mGal, located over the Aegir Ridge valley, while the maximum of 50 mGal is over the Aegir Ridge axial mountains (Figs 9 and 12B). The area south of the Jan Mayen Trough shows several smaller bathymetric ridges having positive gravity signatures, mostly to the north of Profile 7-00. There is a NE-trending, weakly negative anomaly south of
these ridges, resembling the Jan Mayen Trough signature to the north. Profile 7-00 crosses this obliquely between OBSs 48 and 49 (Fig. 9). The gravity minimum lies between the two deepest Moho parts, and appears related to reduced middle- and lower crustal velocity, indicating reduced density (Ludwig et al. 1970).

Using a Bouguer plate approximation with a density of 2670 kg m$^{-3}$, the Bouguer correction was calculated for each grid cell (1 arc-minute, Fig. 12C). Since no terrain corrections were applied, the result is a Simple Bouguer gravity map. This map highlights variations in Moho depth across the study area. Still, even if the crust was homogeneous, the Moho depth cannot be calculated directly from the Bouguer gravity without correcting for the thermal/density structure of the mantle (Greenhalgh & Kusznir 2007).

The thin oceanic crust/shallow mantle in the Norway Basin gives high Bouguer gravity values. The boundary between the oceanic basin and the JMMC volcanic margin shows as a N–S oriented gradient going from the West Jan Mayen Fracture Zone (WJMFZ) in the north down to the tip of the Aegir Ridge in the south. The northern JMR shows reduced gravity following the extent of the bathymetric ridge (Fig. 12C), and the thin crust of the continental Jan Mayen Basin to the west (Kodaira et al. 1998) shows high anomalies. There is no clear gradient at the western side of the JMMC: The oceanic crust created at the Kolbeinsey Ridge north of Iceland is thicker than the world average (Kodaira et al. 1997), the lithosphere younger and hotter, and hence the Bouguer gravity is lower than in the Jan Mayen and Norway basins. The Bouguer gravity is low around Iceland where the crust is thick. Judging from the Bouguer map, Icelandic crustal growth may reach the area of Profile 7-00, likely contributing to the crustal thickness in the west.

4.2 Magnetic anomalies

Recent aeromagnetic surveys cover the EJMFZ (Gernigon et al. 2009) and the eastern Norway Basin (Olesen et al. 2010; Gernigon
but not the western side (Fig. 12D). Thus the existing magnetic data provide incomplete constraints on the development of the JMMC as it rifted from East Greenland. The JAS-05 aero-magnetic survey (Gernigon et al. 2009) is blended in with the older Verhoef et al. (1996) compilation in Fig. 12(D). The JAS-05 version shown here has a grid resolution of $2 \times 2$ km, upwards continued 2 km. It constrains the EJMFZ better than the gravity, so that the northern trace was moved up to 20 km northwards in the west, and $\sim 50$ km closer to Jan Mayen, compared to the interpretation by Breivik et al. (2006).

Oceanic spreading on the Kolbeinsey Ridge resulted in clear magnetic seafloor spreading anomalies to the west. The Jan Mayen island and its surrounding areas have a strong, positive magnetic anomaly associated with recent volcanism. The JMR south of the island has a subdued magnetic field, and the magnetic quiet zone west of the ridge covers stretched continental crust (Kodaira et al. 1998).

There are high-amplitude, positive anomalies in the Jan Mayen Trough. South of the trough, there is a linear, low-amplitude NNE trend. Talwani & Eldholm (1977) proposed that the pattern could be caused by continental fragments or ridges, embedded in oceanic crust. However, we do not find a clear correlation between the magnetic anomalies and the velocity structure (Fig. 9).

We use the magnetic tracks collected during seismic shooting to do a high-resolution study of the breakup process. Both tracks show the anomaly 24a/24b pair adjacent to the JMMC/Iceland Plateau (Figs 5 and 9), though they have a lower amplitude than on the Norwegian side. Anomaly identifications were tested through forward spreading rate modelling based on the timescale of Cande & Kent (1995), used to calculate synthetic magnetic anomalies (Figs 14 and 15). Past magnetic inclination and declination was set to equal that of the present Møre Margin, where the JMMC was at breakup time. Europe has also moved a few degrees to the north in relation to the

Figure 7. Data, interpretation and ray tracing of OBS 50, Profile 7-00, southern Jan Mayen microcontinent/Iceland Plateau. (A) OBS data, vertical component; (B) interpretation and model reproduction; and (C) ray tracing of the velocity model.
pole since then (e.g. Torsvik et al. 2001), which we have not tried to compensate for as the modelling results are insensitive to reasonable variations of these parameters. The spreading rates based on the forward magnetic modelling have an estimated uncertainty of ±2 mm a$^{-1}$. The profiles also need to be projected onto the spreading direction (Fig. 1). The estimated flowlines are from Breivik et al. (2006), which are strongly constrained by the EJMFZ. Additional uncertainty arises from the fairly high angle projection to spreading direction, and we show the effect of a 10$^\circ$ variation (Figs 14 and 15).

Profile 8-00 required a lower early opening rate than at the Norwegian side (Breivik et al. 2006 2009), but higher after anomaly 22 (Fig. 14D). This could be the result of asymmetric spreading or axial relocation. Profile 7-00 offers a complete section from crustal breakup to the extinction of spreading at the Aegir Ridge. After projection to the estimated spreading direction (Breivik et al. 2006), the spreading rates are comparable to that found at the eastern side of the Norway Basin, with early half-spreading rates exceeding 30 mm a$^{-1}$. The largest deviation occurs around anomaly 23, where rates are lower before, but higher afterwards. The transition to ultra-slow seafloor spreading occurs over anomaly 20, at ∼43 Ma (Cande & Kent 1995), as for the eastern side. This change was also detected around the EJMFZ from the JAS-05 magnetic data (Gernigon et al. 2009), but it does not occur at the Mohn Ridge to the north of the fracture zone (Mosar et al. 2002; Gernigon et al. 2009). The rapid fall in spreading rate is therefore likely to be caused by the onset of major stretching of the JMMC, then part of eastern Greenland. The slowest seafloor spreading recorded on both sides of the Aegir Ridge takes place during the following 3 Myr after this occurred. Seafloor spreading rates apparently increase somewhat after that, until the extinction of the Aegir Ridge at ∼25 Ma (Nunns 1982, 1983).
Figure 9. Gridded crustal velocity model for profile 7-00. The parts of the model not covered by P-wave rays are masked. Rays from floating reflectors do not constrain velocity and are not included in the ray coverage. The OBS locations are numbered on the seafloor. Hachure indicates the continent–ocean transtion. Both gravity (red line) (Andersen et al. 2008) and magnetic anomalies (blue line) with anomaly identifications are shown in the panel above.

Figure 10. Profile 7-00 P-wave model sensitivity to lower crustal velocity changes against Moho depth between 180 and 280 km, based on $P_{gh}$, $P_{gh}P$ and $P_n$ phases. Background shading indicates the ability of the model to trace arrivals to all observed locations. It starts at 2 per cent loss and reaches black at 15 per cent loss out of 413 picked arrivals. (A) P-wave $\chi^2$ fit; (B) P-wave rms time fit.
5 DISCUSSION

The JMMC south of the Jan Mayen Trough has not previously been studied by deep seismic data, and the southern limit of the microcontinent is not easily identified (Talwani & Eldholm 1977). Before we take a closer look at the properties of the eastern volcanic margin on the profiles, we will shortly discuss the regional extent of both the JMMC and that of the breakup magmatism.

5.1 Microcontinent and volcanic margin extent

In addition to the OBS data, other data and plate tectonic considerations give good indications of the continental extent. The northern part must be limited by the EJMFZ, to fit in south of the Voring Plateau (Fig. 12). Interpretation of the fracture zone system based on new magnetic data (Gernigon et al. 2009) constrains the EJMFZ south of the island of Jan Mayen. There are clear seafloor spreading anomalies up to anomaly 24 between the fracture zone traces (Gernigon et al. 2009). The JMMC must therefore extend to the northern fracture zone trace, but the island of Jan Mayen itself appears to be entirely volcanic. A recent plate reconstruction indicates the same (Gaina et al. 2009). It is therefore uncertain if there is a link between the southern EJMFZ trace and the northernmost fracture zone on the Kolbeinsey Ridge as proposed by Mjelde et al. (2008a).

The northernmost part of the JMMC and of the eastern volcanic margin are poorly constrained, as are the offsets over the fracture zone. The latter are estimated from the magnetic anomaly pattern in the east, and by the offset of the fracture zone on the Kolbeinsey Ridge in the west (Fig. 12).
Figure 12. The extent of the Jan Mayen microcontinent and its eastern volcanic margin interpreted from OBS results and map data. All maps are illuminated from the west. Dashed lines represent estimated flowlines (Breivik et al. 2006). (A) Bathymetry (Jakobsson et al. 2008). (B) Free-air satellite-based gravity map (DNSC08) (Andersen et al. 2008). (C) Simple Bouguer map made from the satellite gravity map in B and from bathymetry in A. (D) Magnetic anomaly map over the study area (Verhoef et al. 1996), enhanced by the JAS-05 aeromagnetic survey in the north (Gernigon et al. 2009). Our year 2000 track data are also plotted along OBS lines.
The western JMMC limit is well constrained by OBS data in the north (Kodaira et al. 1997, 1998) The old OBS Profile 3-95 is shown together with Profile 8-00 in a perspective plot of the bathymetry (Fig. 13). The seafloor of the models meets the seafloor grid at the cutout, following the shot line. The figure illustrates that the crust underlying the Jan Mayen Basin is both much thinner, and has lower velocity than the oceanic crust to the west, and that the transition from continental to oceanic crust takes place over a narrow zone. Note also the striking difference between the magma starved oceanic crust of the Norway Basin, and the thick oceanic crust of the Iceland Plateau. See Mjelde et al. (2008b) for a discussion of the complete crustal transect from the Norwegian to the East Greenland margins.

The continent–ocean transition obtained from Profile 3-95 in the northwest matches the appearance of the first magnetic seafloor spreading anomaly from the Kolbeinsey Ridge (Fig. 12D). These anomalies can be followed to the Iceland shelf in the SW, where they disappear into a chaotic pattern. If this defines the only seafloor spreading on the Iceland Plateau, that implies that the JMMC widens considerably to the south (e.g. Mjelde et al. 2008a), and that the western part of Profile 7-00 should be predominantly continental. However, an intermediate seafloor spreading axis west of the Aegir Ridge could have existed before seafloor spreading commenced at the Kolbeinsey Ridge (e.g. Vogt et al. 1970; Talwani & Eldholm 1977). However, this idea was later dismissed by Vogt et al. (1980), and as the data coverage has improved, there are still no obvious indications of any such seafloor spreading. Since the Aegir Ridge seaﬂoor spreading slowed down at 42 Ma, plate movement must have been taken up elsewhere from then and up to 25 Ma when
the Kolbeinsey Ridge spreading started. That there was a lot of extensional deformation of the JMMC in the north during breakup from East Greenland is well documented (e.g. Myhre et al. 1984; Gudlaugsson et al. 1988; Kodaira et al. 1998), and it is quite possible that this process would be sufficient to also account for the asymmetric seafloor spreading in the south (Nunns 1982; Skogseid & Eldholm 1987). Still, the JMMC is severely thinned in the northwest (Kodaira et al. 1998), while the crust in the south is both thicker, and has higher velocity (Figs 5, 9 and 13). As discussed above, the Bouguer gravity map (Fig. 12C) indicates that Profile 7-00 may be affected by igneous crustal growth near Iceland, which can explain these north to south differences.

The velocity is too high throughout the southern profile to give an unambiguous identification of continental crust, and we have to rely on more indirect arguments. The deepest Moho is located next to oceanic crust created during the earliest seafloor spreading in the Norwegian Basin, and the dimension is comparable to that of the JMMC on the northern profile (Fig. 13). The velocity falls slightly at mid-crustal levels here, and the gravity low above is slightly skewed to the west compared to the greatest Moho depth (Fig. 9), both indicating a different crustal composition compared to surrounding areas. An alternative interpretation could be that this region is the relic of an intermediate spreading ridge. There are two issues that speak against this. First of all, 18-km-thick oceanic crust must be produced during a period where the Iceland hotspot activity was low (e.g. White 1997). Later spreading on the Kolbeinsey Ridge produced only 9-km-thick oceanic crust during stronger hotspot activity (Kodaira et al. 1997). The interpretation would also imply that the Early Eocene volcanic margin was rifted off Greenland, leaving the continental crust behind. As the magnetic anomalies produce similar early plate spreading rates to that of the conjugate Møre Margin, the margin is clearly not affected by any igneous overprint from nearby later magmatism. Also the smooth tapering of the volcanic margin into the Norwegian Basin indicates that there was no later tectonic deformation. West of the volcanic margin, the magnetic field is subdued and comparable to that of continental crust to the north (Fig. 12D). Seafloor created around the Kolbeinsey Ridge shows linear, high-amplitude seafloor spreading anomalies. The Iceland-Faeroe Ridge and the Iceland shelf that were created through voluminous magmatism have similarly high magnetic amplitudes, but in a chaotic pattern. Taken together, these observations and considerations make us conclude that the JMMC is present in the western part of Profile 7-00 in the south, but also that it is probably affected by later magmatism tied to the growth of Iceland, which was also argued by Gaietà et al. (2009). NNE-trending lower amplitude lineations seen around Profile 7-00 could indicate dyke intrusions of the JMMC south on the Iceland Plateau.

The continental crust may terminate at the proposed Faeroe Fracture Zone in the south, possibly linking the continental Clair lineament to the Tjörnes Fracture Zone in northernmost Iceland (e.g. Kimbell et al. 2005; Mjelde et al. 2008a). There was an offset between the Aegir and Reykjanes ridges, but the link between the two is obscured by the extensive magmatism of the Iceland-Faeroe Ridge. Zircons of Mesozoic age found in NE Iceland indicate that continental crust may be present SW of the proposed lineament (Paquette et al. 2006). Similar to that of the conjugate Møre-Faeroes margin (Berndt et al. 2001; Breivik et al. 2006; White et al. 2008), there is a north to south increase in magma productivity. The width of the thickened oceanic crust of the volcanic margin increases greatly from north to south (Fig. 12). Breakup magmatism was over by ~52.5 Ma at Profile 8-00, by ~51.5 Ma on Profile 1-00 on the conjugate margin slightly to the south (Breivik et al. 2006) and by ~47 Ma on Profile 7-00. The duration of excess magmatism at Profile 8-00 in the north may be as short as 1–1.5 Myr (Fig. 5), while at Profile 7-00 in the south excess magmatism was greater and lasted up to ~7 Myr (Figs 9 and 14). The part of the volcanic margin extrapolated to the south past Profile 7-00 probably curves more to the west than that proposed by Mjelde et al. (2008a), as indicated by the synthetic flowlines backcalculated from the Aegir Ridge (Breivik et al. 2006).

5.2 Igneous thickness compared to velocity ($H-V \rho$)

Seafloor spreading causes passive, corner-flow mantle upwelling underneath the spreading axis, and as mantle rocks cross the solidus the mantle undergoes partial melting. The more incompatible elements enter the melt phase first, and different minerals melt at different degrees of melting over different pressure ranges (e.g. Klein & Langmuir 1987; McKenzie & Bickle 1988). Increasing the melt degree will give an increased MgO content, resulting in higher velocity of the igneous rocks (e.g. White 1989; Korenaga et al. 2002). Elevated temperature will increase the mantle melt degree, and therefore give a positive correlation between velocity and thickness of the igneous section produced at volcanic margins. Other mechanisms that could govern magma productivity will give different correlations. Active mantle convection giving increased
flux of mantle material through the melt zone will produce thicker igneous crust at a lower melt degree (Holbrook et al. 2001; Parkin & White 2008), which will result in low correlation. If the mantle melting is controlled by enriched mantle components, the result will be a negative correlation (Korenaga et al. 2002; Sallarès et al. 2005; Parkin & White 2008).

Magma fractionation in the crust will enrich minerals with high velocity in the lower crust, which would bias the analysis. On the other hand, fractionation in the upper mantle will prevent these components from becoming part of the crust, and would lower crustal velocity. It is believed that these processes may cancel each other (e.g. Korenaga et al. 2002; Parkin & White 2008), and that the main problem with finding a mean velocity of the igneous section is tied to the effect of cracks and fissures, which lower the velocity. This effect dominates the upper oceanic crust (Wilkens et al. 1991; Jacobson 1992), and must be corrected for. Also, velocities are both pressure and temperature dependent (e.g. Fountain & Christensen 1989). To make results and melting models comparable, velocities should also be corrected from the in situ temperature and pressure to a reference state. To estimate the in situ conditions, we use $0.00022 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ MPa}^{-1}$ and $-0.0005 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ °C}^{-1}$ (Holbrook et al. 2001), assuming a linear temperature gradient from 10 °C at the seafloor to 750 °C at 40 km depth. Corrections are applied to each grid cell of the gridded velocity models (Figs 5 and 9), before calculating the mean velocity. Pressure is estimated by first converting velocity to density following the empirical relationship of Ludwig...
Figure 16. Crustal thickness variations plotted against mean $V_P$ for the igneous crust for Profile 8-00. Large circles are pressure and temperature corrected, while small circles are uncorrected. The colour coding indicates the profile positions for the data, where grey symbols indicate thin oceanic crust, and white symbols the continental ridge and westwards. (A) Using the Parkin & White (2008) and White et al. (2008) approach. The reference curve for mantle melting is based on Sallarès et al. (2005), as presented by White et al. (2008). The temperature increase over normal seafloor spreading to produce a given velocity is from White et al. (2008). (B) Mean crustal velocity based on the corrections of Holbrook et al. (2001). The mantle melting lines are from the same source, where $\chi$ indicates the degree of active upwelling ($\chi = 1$ is passive). Mantle temperature anomalies are relative to 1300 °C.

et al. (1970). The weight of the overlying column, including the seawater, can then be calculated.

Different corrections have been used by different authors, so that the mean velocity cannot necessarily be directly compared between studies, but only to their own reference models. To reduce the effect of porosity, Holbrook et al. (2001) adjusted upper crustal velocities lower than 6.85 km s$^{-1}$ up to that value, before temperature and pressure correction to 400 °C and 600 MPa. Parkin & White (2008) and White et al. (2008) ignored the upper crust altogether in the velocity calculations, and only used the lower crust having a velocity above 6.7 km s$^{-1}$. They further used a reference temperature of 150 °C and a pressure of 230 MPa, which is typical for the lower crustal conditions of the NE Atlantic margins. Their velocity data were therefore not corrected before calculating velocity means. We tried out both of these procedures on our profiles. Also the effect of actually doing pressure and temperature corrections for the Parkin & White (2008) procedure was tested, and proves to be minor. On the other hand, the effects are major for the Holbrook et al. (2001) procedure.

We take a closer look at the properties of the volcanic margin of the eastern JMMC, starting in the north. Using the corrections of Holbrook et al. (2001), the mean velocity shows a positive correlation with crustal thickness here, indicating a 50 °C temperature drop from breakup to normal seafloor spreading (Fig. 16B). However, the velocity curve is low in the diagram, indicating a drop from a $-50$ °C to $-100$ °C temperature anomaly relative to a normal 1300 °C mantle temperature. The result is curious in that it indicates an elevated temperature at breakup, but within an...
unusually cold mantle. On the other hand, using the procedure of Parkin & White (2008), the mean velocity is higher, but the curve shape has changed (Fig. 16A). Since only the lower crust is used in the calculations, the results are more sensitive to the variations there with this procedure. However, the velocities of the thin oceanic crust indicate normal mantle temperature. Both models indicate a 50 °C mantle temperature drop from breakup to normal seafloor spreading.

Profile 7-00 shows that an oceanic crust up to 12 km thick was produced after breakup (Fig. 9). Both correction procedures give a positive $H-V_p$ correlation from 4 to 12 km thickness (Fig. 17). In the Holbrook et al. (2001) diagram, the data points lie between passive...
and two-times active upwelling, but with passive upwelling within the estimated uncertainty (Fig. 10). The predicted initial positive mantle temperature anomaly is ~50°C, followed by a temperature drop of as much as 150°C. Using the procedure of Parkin & White (2008), the temperature anomaly at breakup becomes ~90°C. This is higher than that obtained by using Holbrook et al. (2001), but the cooling trend is at ~90°C, less (Fig. 17).

The $H-V_p$ correlation is positive from the Norway Basin up to 200 km in the model (Fig. 9). From there the level flattens out to 175 km, and west of that the velocity falls over what we interpret to be the southern JMMC. The mean velocities do not reach the same high levels farther west, indicating older continental crust mixed with Cenozoic igneous rocks, consistent with the plate tectonic considerations above.

## 6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Two OBS profiles were acquired across the northern and southern JMMC/Iceland Plateau, respectively, both extending into the oceanic western Norway Basin. The data were modelled by ray tracing of the $P$ waves, giving velocity transects of the crust and uppermost mantle. The eastern JMMC margin is conjugate to the passive volcanic More-Faeroes Margin. The Early Eocene breakup magmatism was moderate in the north, and the continental part is easily identified. Both profiles show a maximum Moho depth of 17–18 km under the eastern JMMC/Iceland Plateau. Late Oligocene breakup from Greenland extended the northwestern JMMC down to a thickness of 5–7 km (Kodaira et al. 1998). However, at the southern profile the crust is 14–17 km thick under the Iceland Plateau. The magnetic map does not show clear seafloor spreading anomalies here, and the magnetic anomaly amplitudes are lower than in the adjacent oceanic basins. Our preferred interpretation is therefore that the area consists of older continental crust with a newer magmatic addition. Being close to Iceland, this could be caused by the Iceland hotspot throughout continental rifting, or by post-rift magmatic growth of the crust due to the Neogene emergence of Iceland nearby. The volcanic margin itself shows every characteristic of the conjugate margin, and appears unaffected by tectonism or by secondary magmatism since breakup.

Our magnetic track data show seafloor spreading rates off the southeastern JMMC comparable to that of the conjugate More Margin (Breivik et al. 2006). Both sides show the transition from slow to ultrasonic seafloor spreading to occur at ~43 Ma. We interpret this as the response to the onset of major stretching of the western JMMC at that time, which would take up some of the movement between Europe and Greenland.

The Early Eocene breakup magmatism increased from north to south. It lasted 1–1.5 Myr and produced up to ~3 km of extra crustal thickness compared to the later seafloor spreading in the north. At the southern profile, the early igneous section is ~8 km thicker, and excess magmatism lasted up to ~7 Myr. Igneous thickness has a positive correlation with corrected mean $P$-wave velocity. This is consistent with excess magmatism being caused by elevated mantle temperature, and there is no evidence of small-scale mantle convection or increased mantle melt fertility contributing. We tried two related, but slightly different procedures to estimate the mantle temperature anomaly. Using the Parkin & White (2008) procedure, the excess mantle temperature is estimated to ~90°C in the south. By using the procedure of Holbrook et al. (2001) it is estimated to as much as ~150°C. Both procedures estimate the temperature anomaly to ~50°C in the north. Absolute mantle temperature estimates differ between the two, but the trend should be more robust in diagnosing process rather than the absolute level of the velocity, and here they agree.
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