My intention, when I first went to Princeton as a graduate student, was to write a dissertation in econometrics. That first year was a revelation. In the first semester, after learning choice theory from Mark Machina, we were taught the failings of the welfare theorems by Joe Stiglitz. Then, finally, Hugo taught us the welfare theorems in the second semester, and there was no going back. Hugo is an inspiring teacher; my thoughts of becoming an econometrician disappeared that year.

Hugo’s track record as an advisor speaks for itself. Hugo’s ability to ask just the right question was invaluable. At one point, I was discussing what I thought was a complete paper with Hugo. The model in the paper was a parametric example of simultaneous signaling in an oligopoly model, and I had explored various questions in that model concerning existence of equilibria and the relationship between finite number and a continuum of types. Hugo asked just the right question: “How important were the parametric assumptions to the results?” Answering that question did take a little time, but I hope Hugo was not disappointed in the results.

Many people have commented over the years on Hugo’s ability to create an exceptional intellectual environment among the theory students at Princeton. Since many of us were fascinated by game theory at the time, an area not at the center of Hugo’s own areas of research, this is even more noteworthy. His ability to always ask the “right” question was critical.

Hugo then became Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania, and so Hugo was again my “boss.” We spent an enjoyable semester co-teaching a section of the introductory microeconomics course. Hugo also convinced me to participate in undergraduate college life (at least to the extent of having dinner one night at the undergraduate college he was living in at the time). It was at that dinner that I learned from Hugo of the overlap between the current research of a graduate student at Princeton (Jeroen Swinkels) and a project that I was working on with Larry Samuelson. I can think of no more fitting testimony to his influence on me than the resulting series of papers.
It is a pleasure to participate in this volume, because, unlike the other contributors, I cannot claim Hugo for my main advisor; he left for Penn at the end of my second year at Princeton. (Avinash Dixit gracefully stepped in as my advisor.) Hugo played three distinct and key roles in this paper. First, he supervised my second year paper, which is when I began exploring this topic. Hugo was, of course, also George’s advisor. Finally, it is through Hugo that George and Larry on the one side, and I, on the other, learned that we had been pursuing parallel tracks of research. Thus, we learned of each other’s work early enough to have a very rewarding coauthorship. The multiple ways in which Hugo is connected to this paper are, I think, symptomatic of how deeply Hugo was involved in a huge amount of what was going on in game theory at that time. There are so many papers from that period without Hugo’s name on them but where his hand can be clearly seen.

Hugo’s role in my development became more limited after his move to Penn. But, this paper was my first real research effort, and it’s when I began to learn how to write. I remember the writing critiques particularly well: at our first meeting after I’d turned in a draft, I thought maybe Hugo had been busy, because we spent 45 minutes talking mostly about the first two paragraphs. The real point, of course, was the degree of precision and effort that good writing requires. The other thing I remember most about this period is Hugo’s exceptional patience and generosity. It’s not just that he made the time and emotional energy for his students, but that he made it seem easy. Given the number of other things he was up to, one would suspect that this seeming effortlessness wasn’t.