A psychological theory represents the mind as epistemically bounded if it is a consequence of the theory that our cognitive organization imposes epistemically significant constraints on the beliefs that we can entertain.

Three arguments for epistemic boundedness are evaluated. Two of them—Colin McGinn's argument and the argument from mediocrity—are found to be defective. The third—Jerry Fodor's—underwrite no more than the relatively weak conclusion that we are dialectically justified in presuming that the mind is epistemically bounded when conversing with our cognitive-scientific colleagues.