“Significs” sounds to me narrower than Semeiotic, since *signification* is only one of the two chief functions of signs; as the elegant and correct John of Salisbury notices, in referring to “quod fere in omnium ore celebre est, aliud scilicet esse quod appellatiua significant, et aliud esse quod nominant. Nominantur singularia, sed uniuersalia significantur.” (*Metalogicus* II. xx. I copy from the ed. of 1620.) So *significs* appears to be limited to the study of the relations of Signs to their Interpretants; and I presume you do so limit it. On the other hand Logic is more interested in the *Truth* of Signs, i.e. in their relation to their Objects. But I am satisfied that in the present state of the subject, there is but one General science of the nature of Signs.