

This equitable lien is so far a mortgage, that the limitation or
 *presumption of satisfaction arising from the lapse of
500 twenty years, as applicable to ordinary mortgages, does, in
 like manner, furnish evidence, or a presumption, that such equitable
 lien has been satisfied or discharged. An equitable lien is founded
 upon the principle, that the legal title has not been parted with, or
 ought not to be considered as completely vested in the vendee
 until the whole purchase money has been paid; because it is
 deemed unjust to consider any one as the absolute legal owner of
 property which he has purchased, but has not paid for. If the
 whole legal title remains in the vendor, he may bring an eject-
 ment, to which a limitation of not less than twenty years is a bar:
 but if the formal legal title has been parted with by the vendor
 before payment, then his having so ceded it, gives him an equita-
 ble right to enforce payment here with all the advantages he had
 as the actual holder of the legal title; that is, as a mortgagee
 coming here to foreclose; in which case, by analogy to the Statute
 of Limitations, no time short of the lapse of twenty years is ever
 deemed sufficient to raise a presumption of satisfaction. This
 Court has repeatedly acted upon these principles. *Lingan v.*
Henderson, ante, 282.

This bill has been treated by the defendant as a suit instituted
 to recover the money secured by the bond alone, or a debt due by
 simple contract. If that were the fact, the conclusions which he
 has deduced, it is admitted, must inevitably follow. But it has
 been shewn that such is not the fact; and the circumstance, of the
 purchase money having been secured by a bond, in addition to the
 security of the equitable lien, cannot in the slightest degree affect
 the plaintiffs' right to the relief they ask by this bill. In all cases
 of the sale of real estate the purchase money, if not paid, may be
 secured in various ways. The vendor may take a mortgage, but
 by doing so he virtually waives his equitable lien; he may take a
 bond, and also a note in addition to a mortgage, or the equitable
 lien, of which the bond or note will not generally amount to a
 virtual waiver. If he takes all these assurances, then it is well
 settled, that he may proceed at law and in equity upon each of
 them at one and the same time, and recover upon all, although he
 can have but one satisfaction. *Pow. Mort. 966, note G; Hughes v.*
Edwards, 9 Wheat. 494. To his ejectment at law and bill in equity
 to foreclose, twenty years is the limitation; to his suit upon the
 bond, twelve years constitutes a bar; and to his action *upon
501 the simple contract a limitation of three years is a bar.
 But although in the actions upon the bond and the simple contract
 judgment may be rendered against him, upon the plea of limita-
 tion applicable to each, that cannot, in any manner, affect his
 remedy by ejectment or the bill to foreclose. *Toplis v. Baker, 2*
Cox, 123.