A Wittgenstein-esque Rule-Following Argument (cf. §201)
(1) Understanding an expression requires understanding the rule for its use.
(2) Assume (for *reductio*) that understanding a rule for the use of an expression requires understanding an interpretation of the expression.
(3) Then, understanding a particular expression E requires understanding its interpretation S.   [From (1), (2)]
(4) Yet understanding S also requires understanding an interpretation of S, say S_1.   [From (1), (2)]
(5) And understanding S_1 requires understanding its interpretation, call it S_2.   [From (1), (2)]

                     (And so on…)
(6) So, understanding E requires understanding infinitely many interpretations.   [From the preceding]
(7) So "there is a way of grasping a rule that is *not* [understanding] an interpretation"   [By *reductio*, (2)-(6)]

Wittgenstein-esque Arguments Against Private Language.
The Criterion Argument (cf. §258)
(1) The correct use of an expression requires a criterion of correctness.
(2) There is no criterion of correctness for private expressions: "I have no criterion of correctness…whatever is going to seem correct to me is correct" (§258).
(3) So, a private expression does not have a correct use: "And that only means that here we can't talk about 'correct'." [From (1), (2)]

The Custom Argument (cf. §198-202)
(1) Using an expression correctly requires following the rule for its use.
(2) *Following* a rule requires a custom; (cf. the sign post in §198).
(3) Customs are practices embedded in a community.
(4) So, following a rule requires a community: " 'following a rule' is a practice…And that's why it's not possible to follow a rule 'privately'" (§202). [From (2), (3)]
(5) So, using an expression correctly requires a community. [From (1), (4)]

The Pragmatic Argument (cf. §270; see also §260, §268)
(1) There would be no purpose to using a name correctly for a private sensation: "mak[ing] a mistake…does not make any difference at all" (§270).
(2) If (1) is true, then such a name has no correct/incorrect use: "And this alone shows that the supposition of this mistake was merely sham" (§270).
(3) So, such a name has no correct/incorrect use. [From (1), (2)]

The "No Private Objects" Argument
(1) The idea of a private language assumes the "object-name" model of sensation talk. (cf. §§258, 270, passim.)
(2) This "object-name" model is an error. (cf. §§293-315)
(3) So, the very idea of a private language contains an error. [From (1), (2)]