

Genesis, Part 28

In this session, we will be going back over the material we covered last time to expand on some details. Our focus will be on the marriage of Jacob to Leah and Rachel to get a clearer picture of how and why the events occurred as they did. That requires a deeper look into some traditions and practices of the times and the culture of those involved.

The Traditional Wedding

This process has been discussed in a bit more detail in an earlier study on the “Feasts of the Lord”. Modern wedding traditions in both Jewish and Arab cultures today differ from what was used in the times of the patriarchs up through the time of Christ. Some of these ancient elements and observances may remain, but the wedding itself generally resembles one we would be familiar with. One example is that, with the possible exception of some ultra-orthodox groups, marriages are not arranged without the couple’s consent. Often there is a marriage contract between the two families but with the bride and groom’s participation.

The traditional, Near-Eastern, marriage process observed in Israel during the times of Christ was generally as follows:

1. The marriage contract between the two families spelling out the rights of the bride is signed. Once the contract is signed and gifts exchanged the couple is considered legally married but they do not immediately consummate the marriage.
2. Then we have a betrothal period where the groom goes away to his father’s house to prepare a place for his bride. Once the father of the groom determines the arrangements to receive the bride are complete, he sends his son to retrieve his bride. This could be days, weeks, even a year or more.
3. The groom goes to retrieve his bride usually accompanied by the wedding guests, brings her back to his father’s house, enters the prepared bridal suite, and they consummate the marriage.
4. The wedding feast proceeds and will be joined later by the couple.

The process outlined in Genesis Chapter 29 is older and a bit different from though resembling what is outlined above. In Chapter 29 we see a process that looks more like this:

1. Jacob approaches Rachel's father Laban and negotiates to marry her. A bride-price is agreed upon (seven years of service to Laban) and permission to marry is granted. The marriage contract seen here is verbal.
2. Seven years later after fulfilling his part of the contract, Jacob approaches Laban for him to fulfill his part of the agreement and set the wedding. Laban agrees.
3. There is a "wedding *party*". Unlike the later version of a wedding *feast* that included women, this *party* included only men. (That is significant to the events that follow.)
4. At sunset, Laban presents Jacob with his bride, and they consummate the marriage.
5. The next morning Jacob discovers he has been tricked, and he spent the night with Rachel's sister Leah, not Rachel!
6. After confronting Laban he is informed that it was not practiced in his culture for the younger daughter (Rachel) to marry before the elder daughter (Leah). He proposes a compromise and offers Rachel for another seven years of service. As a consolation, he "graciously" offers to let him marry Rachel now rather than after the agreed seven years, but he had to conclude Leah's "week" (honeymoon) before doing so.
7. Jacob finishes Leah's week, immediately marries Rachel, and then spends a marriage week with her.
8. Jacob has two brides and owes another seven years of service to his trickster father-in-law to pay for the second one.

In trying to understand some of what happened, we have questions, not the least of which is how in the world did Jacob not know he was bedding someone other than Rachel? We will get into that shortly. Meanwhile, we have a few subjects to clarify.

The Bride-Price

Citation: Dr. Kristine Henriksen Garroway, thetorah.com

To marry a woman, a man had to first pay her father a (*mohar*) “bride-price.” The price can vary depending on time, place, or social status. Certain circumstances can demand a larger payment than normal. For instance, after Shechem debases Jacob’s daughter Dinah, eager to get Jacob and his sons to allow him to marry the girl, he offers a higher bride-price than would be expected for someone in Dinah’s situation (Gen 34:11-12). This is being suggested because he placed himself at a disadvantage by taking the girl without permission and before they were married.

In another example, Saul demands an unusual bride-price of the foreskins of a hundred Philistines from David to marry his daughter Michal (1 Sam 18:25). His objective is to get David killed in the process of collecting the bride-price, but David succeeds and does marry Michal. He later refers back to this as his “betrothal” payment (2 Sam 3:14).

The Marriage Contract

In addition to the bride-price, ancient Near-Eastern documents also mention a marriage contract. Contracts were not always written documents; most times they were oral agreements, such as we see between Jacob and Laban. The terms of these very early marriage contracts include the dowery from the father to the husband and the marriage gifts from the husband to the bride’s family. This latter parallels the biblical *mohar* and was generally composed of movable objects, such as household items, furniture, clothing, textiles, silver, jewelry, handmaids, animals, and sometimes land.

Later, Judaism developed its own version of the marriage contract, called the *ketubah*, which focused on the husband’s financial obligations to the wife. The *ketubah* primarily spelled out the rights of the bride in the marriage.

The Betrothal Period

When a girl’s father agreed to a union between a suitor and his daughter, the suitor often did not have the bride-price handy. This may be one reason for the betrothal period, what the rabbis call *’erusin*. The girl’s betrothal to the man made her unavailable to other men, but she still lived with her father until the man paid the bride-price.

Another reason for the betrothal period is that the marriage agreement was often concluded when the girl was still a minor (i.e., pre-puberty), which was considered to be too early for marriage in ancient Near Eastern cultures. The deal would be concluded and the girl betrothed, but she would not enter the husband's house and the marriage bed until she reached an appropriate age. Thus, the time between betrothal and consummation of the marriage could be quite long. Some old Babylonian contracts include a five- to ten-year betrothal.

Jacob's Deal With Laban

This may help us understand Jacob's deal with Laban. He wishes to marry Rachel, but he has no land or money to speak of; he is a guest in Laban's house. Marriage is not free, so he offers his own labor for seven years as the bride-price. While the text makes no mention of his being betrothed first, Jacob's need to wait until the bride-price is paid in full in order to marry Rachel fits with biblical and ancient Near Eastern practice.

Jacob serves his seven years and asks Laban to fulfill his part of the contract and produce the paid-in-full bride and the wedding. Jacob wanted to marry Rachel and believed he had negotiated and paid the bride-price for her, but on the wedding night, Laban gave him Leah instead. Jacob does not detect the switch until the next morning when he discovers he is married to the wrong daughter. (More on this later.)

If we look at Laban's agreement carefully, we can see that he never explicitly accepts Jacob's proposal or mentions which of his daughters he is offering. "And Laban said, 'It is better that I give her to you than that I should give her to another man'" (Gen 29:19). Give "her". Who is "her"? Jacob thought "her" was Rachel, but Laban cleverly avoided mentioning names. Once the switch is discovered Laban claims that Jacob should have known that in Haran, one does not marry off a younger daughter before the older. Laban was probably implying with that statement that "Surely you must have understood that to marry Rachel, you had to marry Leah first?" And since Jacob took Leah and slept with her, there is no turning back.

A Second Marriage in Reverse Order

Laban does not stop there but offers Jacob a way forward.

Gen 29:27 “Fulfill her week, and we will give you this one also for the service which you will serve with me still another seven years.”

Laban’s intention all along was to trap Jacob into working for him for fourteen years and, at the same time, marry off both his daughters, including the less attractive one for whom Laban would not have otherwise gotten such a large bride-price as he received for Rachel.

Nevertheless, Laban understands that he can only push Jacob so far without causing an out-and-out breach, so he suggests something unusual: Jacob will marry Rachel almost immediately, but pay the bride-price afterward. Jacob agrees to this compromise.

Gen 29:28 Then Jacob did so and fulfilled her week. So he gave him his daughter Rachel as wife also. ²⁹ And Laban gave his maid Bilhah to his daughter Rachel as a maid. ³⁰ Then *Jacob* also went in to Rachel, and he also loved Rachel more than Leah. And he served with Laban still another seven years.

Normally, the bride-price is paid upfront or over a period of time. Only upon payment-in-full does the marriage take place, but here we have Jacob getting Rachel immediately after fulfilling Leah’s “week” and before the payment of any bride-price for her. This reverses the process but is not unheard of in wedding practices of the period.

Marriage Before Payment-in-Full

Sometimes the payment period extends even beyond the wedding, and the final payment takes place *after* consummation of the marriage. The husband supplies money, and the father supplies the sexual rights to his daughter. But the birth of a child, since it is one of the main reasons for marriage, can also be seen as the culmination or final stage of marriage. In many ancient Near Eastern marriage contracts, it stipulates that the husband has until the birth of the first child to make his final payment.

Rachel's Barrenness and the Bride-Price

Despite the couple living together in an intimate relationship, the biblical text assumes that women remain barren until God activates the womb. Thus, whether or not a woman gets pregnant is dependent on God's intervention. Genesis 29:31 tells us that God opened Leah's womb, but this does not explain Rachel's barrenness. So why does God intervene early on behalf of Leah but not Rachel?

Leah, who was married with the bride-price paid up front, has a child every year (six boys and a girl), while Rachel does not have a child until year seven of her marriage. While Rachel requests a son in year four of her marriage, God will not grant her one for three more years—the moment her bride-price is paid in full. In this reading, the story of Rachel's barrenness underscores the incomplete nature of their union until Jacob has paid his debt to Laban in full.

The birth of Joseph occurs around the same time that the bride-price is paid in full, and then Jacob asks to leave and return to his family.

Gen 30:25 And it came to pass, when Rachel had borne Joseph, that Jacob said to Laban, "Send me away, that I may go to my own place and to my country. ²⁶ Give *me* my wives and my children for whom I have served you, and let me go; for you know my service which I have done for you."

Rachel's Infertility

Citation: Prof. Joel Baden, thetorah.com

"Rachel was barren" (Gen 29:31). Aside from her beauty, this is just about the only characterization that Genesis offers of Rachel. Her first words, addressed to Jacob, are: "...Give me children, or I shall die" (Gen 30:1).

The focus on Rachel's infertility, to the exclusion of nearly every other aspect of her identity, means that infertility is effectively her identity. Far more than in most modern societies, Rachel lived in a world that was practically designed to make infertile women feel outcasts and alone. As

has ever been the case, the constant confrontation of the infertile mother with the fertility of her neighbors was a source of pain. In the Bible, this pain is highlighted by the cultural and literary custom of polygyny, the husband having more than one wife, such that Sarah and Rachel lived face to face with the living embodiment of their anguish.

In naming her son Joseph, Rachel makes it clear what infertility feels like: “God has taken away my reproach” (Gen 30:23). “Reproach” or “disgrace” in some translations is the Hebrew word *cherpah* means shame, reproach, or scorn, and is used of uncircumcised men, men with eyes gouged out, cowardliness, rape victims, or even the collapsed walls of Jerusalem. The experience of infertility in ancient Israel was utterly crushing.

There can be no disgrace, no *cherpah*, without other people before whom one feels shame — without other people to do the shaming. Such shaming was often based on the notion that infertility was divine punishment. There is no biblical evidence that Rachel was to blame for her infertility. Tellingly, when she confronts her infertility she neither prays, nor repents of any sin, nor confesses any iniquity, nor asks forgiveness of any kind—she doesn’t turn to God at all. The text does not note any display of virtue, piety, penance, or self-examination leading to a divinely wrought cure. And yet God does make her fertile.

When Rachel becomes pregnant with Joseph, Genesis 30:22 notes that God “opened her womb.” God’s role in conception is depicted as opening the womb, then it would seem that prior to this moment, the womb was—by default—closed.

The best proof of this concept of fertility is not the opening of Rachel’s womb, since we know that she was previously infertile. It is, rather, that the same is said about Leah, Rachel’s fertile counterpart. Before bearing her first child, Reuben, Yahweh “opened her womb” (Gen 29:31), too. If neither Rachel nor Leah can become pregnant without divine intervention, then it seems possible to argue that, from the biblical perspective, all women are “by nature” created infertile.

That all women are “by nature” infertile according to the Bible is borne out by the ostensibly common term “open,” a term that appears rather generic but which, when God is the subject, is both rare and meaningful.

- In Psalm 105:41, Yahweh “opened a rock so that water gushed forth,” an unusual moment for a rock if there ever was one.
- Yahweh opens Isaiah’s ears (Isa 50:4–5), not thereby changing him from deaf to hearing, but transforming his ordinary human ability to hear into the extraordinary prophetic ability to hear Yahweh’s words.
- Yahweh opens Ezekiel’s mouth (Ezek 3:27, also 33:22), not thereby changing him from mute to speaking, but transforming his ordinary human ability to speak into the extraordinary prophetic ability to speak Yahweh’s words.
- Yahweh opens the mouth of Balaam’s donkey (Num 22:28) when Balaam is trying to force it to keep moving with blows. The snake of Genesis 3 notwithstanding, animals are not given to talking.

In short, when God opens something, he changes it from its usual state to an unusual state.

The womb is imagined as a closed chamber, one to which only God holds the key. For a child to be born—and perhaps even for the man’s seed to enter—God must turn the key and unlock the door. It is not that Rachel is barren while Leah is not, but rather that both are barren to begin with, and Leah’s womb is simply opened before Rachel’s. If we say that active participation on the part of God is required for a woman to become fertile, then infertility is not divine punishment; it is rather the state in which all women enter the world.

Direct divine activity is required to “open the womb,” whether a woman has had children before or not, whether she has even tried to become pregnant before or not. Every pregnancy, be it the first or the fifth, is ascribed to God’s power. Sarah, who bears Isaac at ninety years old, says “God has brought me laughter” (Gen 21:6). When Leah, still in her relative youth, bears Issachar, her fifth son, she credits God: “God has given me my reward” (Gen 30:18). For her sixth, Asher, she says “God has given me a choice gift” (Gen 30:20). In the ancient Israelite view, God is involved in every human conception.

When it is recognized that the default state of all women—at all times—is infertile and that God needs to open the womb to allow conception to occur, the idea that infertility should be regularly understood as divine punishment can hardly be maintained. Infertility is not the result of divine punishment but of divine inattention.

The need to get God’s attention explains another element common to the stories of these women. When Rachel’s womb is finally opened, it says that “God remembered Rachel” (Gen 30:22). With Sarah, a close synonym is used, *paqad*: “The Lord took note of Sarah” (Gen 21:1).

Infertility Is Not a Divine Decree

When all of the pieces are put together, it is clear that, from the perspective of these biblical authors, infertility is not a human shortcoming, but a divine one. The Hebrew Bible does present infertility as a religious phenomenon, to be sure. It is, however, not the religious phenomenon commonly assumed. With only the most uncommon exceptions, God does not decree infertility. Those who have never borne children, who have never been able to conceive, have not been punished for any mysterious sin. They have done nothing wrong. It is not their actions that are at the root of their infertility; it is God’s inaction.

From the ancient past to our present, the inability to conceive has always been a source of anguish and confusion, a fundamental question of “Why me?” The conclusion most often reached is a particularly painful and harsh one. The easy association of infertility—as of any impairment—with divine displeasure is an ancient one, and its biblical roots can hardly be denied. But it is only an interpretation, one among many, and it is not necessarily the strongest.

How Is It That Jacob Mistakes Leah for Rachel?

Citation: Dr. Rabbi Zen Farber, thetorah.com

We have previously seen that Jacob contracted to marry Rachel by paying the bride-price of seven years of service to Laban—at least he thought he was contracting for Rachel. Laban cleverly agreed to the deal but never mentioned the name of the bride. At the end of seven years of service,

Jacob asked his future father-in-law to satisfy his end of the contract and set the wedding, which he did. On the night of the wedding, Jacob enters the bridal chamber and consummates the marriage only to wake up the next morning to discover that Laban has switched the older daughter Leah for the younger Rachel.

The question on everyone's mind is how was it possible that Jacob spent the night with Leah all the while thinking she was Rachel? Now, we will attempt to understand how that could have happened within the context of cultural traditions.

Jacob Couldn't See Leah

We begin by noting Genesis 29:23 "Now it came to pass in the evening, that he took Leah his daughter and brought her to Jacob; and he went in to her." That word translated as "evening" can be translated as "night" or "sunset". What is implied here is it was dark. Any illumination would be from oil lamps. I think we can also assume that Leah was veiled with her face covered. Though the text doesn't say so, such was a common way of dressing for women. Though the text uses darkness to explain the trick, this explanation seems insufficient. Wouldn't it be obvious to Jacob that the woman was not Rachel after some brief conversation?

When Jacob tricked Isaac into giving the blessings of the firstborn to him, he deceived his blind or nearly blind father with goat skins and the clothing that Esau wore. But despite these deceptions, Isaac was suspicious of Jacob when he said he was Esau. Isaac felt Jacob and kissed him. Jacob in disguise may have felt and smelled like Esau, but he didn't sound like Esau. His voice was different, and that is what Isaac noticed.

We would expect that even in the darkness Jacob would recognize the voice of Leah as not that of Rachel. The text does not suggest that happened.

Extreme Modesty: No Talking at All

Radak (Rabbi David Kimchi, ca. 1160-1235) suggests that Jacob and Leah were entirely silent for considerations of modesty, but that seems out of keeping with Jacob's kissing Rachel upon their first meeting (Gen 29:11). Even if they were entirely silent during intercourse, did they not talk before

or after either? How much conversation would it take to realize he is not with his beloved of seven years? Isaac is suspicious after Jacob utters only a couple of sentences. There is no indication that Jacob was suspicious based on Leah's voice.

Jacob Was Drunk

The Jewish/Roman historian Josephus suggests that Jacob was drunk mainly based on the fact that Jacob was coming from Laban's "feast". The Hebrew word for "feast," (*mishteh*), can literally mean "drinking party". Genesis 29:22 says, "So Laban gathered together all the people of the place and made a feast." That word translated as "people" is one that generally refers only to men. This apparently was an all-male booze party — no women present, especially not the bride, as the next verse tells us that "in the evening he (Laban) took his daughter Leah and brought her to Jacob." Jacob has no contact with his bride until after the party, after he has been drinking, and after sundown.

Normally there would have been a wedding feast with male and female guests with the bride present, but this all-male-boozer was thrown by Laban instead. The whole purpose was probably to get Jacob drunk so he might not detect the bride switch. Though this interpretation is possible, it could be overreaching to suggest it was part of Laban's plot. However, knowing what we know of Laban, it is certainly plausible. Nor is it unreasonable to suggest that Jacob was intoxicated.

What About Leah and Rachel?

A Rabbinic tradition holds that Rachel warns Jacob about the possibility of such a ruse. This is mainly very loosely based on the statement that Jacob makes to Rachel that he is her father's "brother," implying he is a trickster like her father, but the statement more likely refers to their family relationship and not a character trait. This theory further proposes that Jacob gave Rachel certain signs/tokens, such as verbal cues or physical objects, that she should reveal to him when she enters his tent, and thus he will know it is really her. The problem was that Rachel changed her mind. According to this, Rachel was complicit in tricking Jacob because of sisterly love. However, nothing in the biblical text itself implies that Jacob ever considered he was being fooled or that he ever discussed it with Rachel —

certainly nothing in the text implies that they set up a system of secret communications.

Not Much Romance

We often read the story of Jacob's love for Rachel through the lens of modern romance. We imagine Jacob and Rachel forming a close bond, and spending their seven years of "engagement" speaking to each other about their future together, their interests, etc. This is because, from a modern vantage point, love and friendship are intertwined, and marriage is a bond contracted between equals based on mutual consent and attraction.

But the Torah envisions a very different reality. Jacob is told by his parents that he must marry one of Laban's daughters, but he can choose which one. Immediately after Laban asks Jacob what his wages should be, and right before Jacob answers that he will work seven years for Rachel, the text explains how Jacob made his choice:

Gen 29:16 Now Laban had two daughters. The name of the older was Leah, and the name of the younger was Rachel. 17 Leah's eyes were weak, but Rachel was beautiful in form and appearance. 18 Jacob loved Rachel. And he said, "I will serve you seven years for your younger daughter Rachel."

The Hebrew word translated "love" here can be seen as extending from romantic love, to infatuation, or simply to lust. In this case, it is probably best to translate "Jacob was smitten by Rachel". The point is, that Jacob's love, infatuation for, or lust for Rachel is because of her beauty, and this is why he chose to marry her and not Leah.

Jacob's further actions demonstrate that whereas he thought of Laban as a person with whom he needed to negotiate, he thought of Rachel only as the commodity he was acquiring. Jacob purchases the right to marry the beautiful Rachel from her father with seven years' work. No mention is made of Jacob speaking to Rachel about it or Rachel being asked. Jacob does the work, happy to have found such a beautiful future wife, and after the seven years are up, Jacob comes to Laban ready to take Rachel to his tent:

Gen 29:21 Then Jacob said to Laban, “Give me my wife that I may go into her, for my time is completed.”

Note that Jacob says, “Give me my wife that I may go into her.” This sounds rather sexually crude and lacking feelings of affection to me.

He doesn't speak to Rachel about it, or come to tell her that it is time to marry. As noted earlier, when Laban throws a feast in honor of the upcoming marriage, the bride isn't even there; it is a celebration between the two parties of the deal, Jacob and Laban.

As Jacob views his marriage as a business transaction between him and Laban, when he sees Leah in his tent instead of Rachel the next morning, he does not confront Leah with the trick, or Rachel for that matter, but goes straight to Laban.

In Jacob and Laban's business arrangement, Rachel and Leah are chattel; it was never up to them. That Rachel and Leah also see it this way is clear later when Jacob complains to them that he is afraid of their father and wishes to leave Haran. Both sisters respond:

Gen 31:14 Then Rachel and Leah answered and said to him, “Is there any portion or inheritance left to us in our father's house? 15 Are we not regarded by him as foreigners? For he has sold us, and he has indeed devoured our money

It thus seems that the likely explanation for how the narrator imagines Jacob confusing Leah for Rachel so easily, even in the dark, is that, unlike Isaac's familiarity with his two sons, Jacob didn't really know Rachel or Leah all that well. He was smitten with Rachel's beauty and wanted to marry her, but this does not mean that the two of them took long walks and chatted or anything akin to the behavior of a modern couple during courtship. It is likely that Jacob has not spoken to Rachel often or extensively during the seven years, and thus was not very familiar with her voice or her manner of speaking.

That Jacob did not speak much with Rachel before they married may also be the key to understanding Leah and Rachel's behavior. Why do Rachel and Leah go along with the bride switch?

I suggest the following reading: After Jacob makes the deal with Laban and goes off to watch Laban's sheep for seven years, Laban either tells his older daughter Leah that she is to marry Jacob, or says nothing at all. Either way, when Leah is brought to Jacob that night, she believes that he wants to marry her.

Rachel likely believed the same thing, and would not have been hurt by Jacob asking for Leah's hand instead of hers, as she was the younger daughter, and cultural practices demanded the elder daughter marry first. Laban, of course, could not marry off Rachel without endangering his plan to bilk Jacob for seven—and hopefully fourteen—years of work. So Rachel remains single for these (first) seven years until Laban pulls his trick, making it too late for Jacob to back out of the arrangement.

That night, Jacob lies with his new wife, but they do not speak much; they barely know each other anyway. The next morning, he sees that she isn't the beautiful Rachel he remembers, but her less attractive older sister Leah, and he is angry. We do not hear how Leah feels upon seeing her new husband's dismay and learning that he does not really want her, but her younger sister. Nevertheless, from Leah's comments later in the narrative, we can imagine her reaction.

Leah is the despised wife (Gen 29:31). She knows this and names four out of her six sons based on the hope that her providing Jacob with sons will make him love her. Leah is deeply pained by Jacob's rejection of her and his preference for her sister. This makes more sense when we realize that Leah believed that Jacob had wanted to marry her originally. This also explains Leah's outburst to Rachel, when she later in Chapter 30 asks Leah for the mandrakes that her son picked for her:

Gen 30:15 But she said to her, "Is it a small matter that **you have taken away my husband?** Would you take away my son's mandrakes also?"

If Leah knew all along that she was tricking Jacob into marrying her, would not the husband theft have been the other way around? After all, Jacob wanted to marry Rachel and that was the deal he struck with their father.

Once we understand that Leah and Rachel were also fooled, we realize that from Leah's vantage point, Jacob was supposed to be her husband. When Laban brought her to Jacob's tent, in her mind, it was her wedding night and Jacob had just worked seven years just to marry her. As Leah experiences it, only in the morning, when Jacob takes a good look at her, does he decide that he has married the wrong sister and goes to Laban to correct this.

Thus, when Leah accuses Rachel of stealing her husband (Gen 30:15), she means it. And she continues to hope that he will change his mind and love her too. According to this reading of the story, Leah was just as shocked as Jacob that fateful morning.

What Do We Have?

We conclude from this that all three were deceived by Laban. Jacob thought he was marrying Rachel. Leah thought she was the intended bride because she was the oldest, and her father likely told her she was the intended. Rachel likely thought Leah was the bride for the same reasons.

To complete his deception, Laban arranged an all-male drinking party to get Jacob drunk enough that in the darkened "bridal chamber" detecting the switch would be difficult. That Jacob did not recognize Leah's voice as not Rachel's was a reasonable possibility because there had likely been only minimal contact between Jacob and the two women and certainly no romantic courtship such as we would consider normal today.

Thus, Jacob entered that tent (or whatever), and it was dark, he was likely tight, neither of them spoke much, and even if they did there was little history of conversations that Jacob could detect the switch.

Since all three were deceived by Laban, when the trick was discovered the next morning Jacob was surprised, but Leah was also surprised to discover her new husband wanted her sister instead. And Rachel was also surprised to discover she was about to get married.