AB Reviews classical arguments for and against the circularity of the law of effect. Demonstrations are made that the law is circular neither by definition nor by proof. The trans-situationality criterion of P. E. Meehl's (see record 1950-04477-001) "Weak Law of Effect" is evaluated. It is argued that trans-situationality has no crucial bearing on the circularity issue, and that it is only one of many criteria warranting reference to the law of effect as a covering law. Arguments that explanations by reference to covering laws are by their nature circular do not speak to the law of effect as such; rather, they are general critiques of the nature of scientific explanation.